



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Per 3977 d. $\frac{201}{25}$



THE
NEW ENGLANDER.

EDITED BY
PROFESSORS GEORGE P. FISHER AND TIMOTHY DWIGHT
AND
WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY, ESQ.

VOLUME XXV, 1866.



MULLIUS ADDICTUS JURARE IN VERBA MAGISTRI.

NEW HAVEN:
PRINTED BY THOMAS J. STAFFORD.
1866.

ERRATA.

Page 58, line 13, should read, " phrase for that charming word *ἀφίλω*, which means the talk of lovers."

Page 627, line 23, for "*could*," read "*would*."

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XXV.

No. I.

ART. I. Country Life in England,	1
Rev. A. D. Gridley, Clinton, N. Y.	
II. Review of Dr. Draper's New Book, "Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America,"	26
Rev. I. N. Tarbox, Boston, Mass.	
III. Lord Derby and Professor Arnold on Homer,	47
Prof. Louis R. Packard, Yale College.	
IV. Expository Preaching,	65
Rev. E. C. Jones, Southington, Conn.	
V. Samuel Fisk,	75
Burdett Hart, Philadelphia, Penn.	
VI. Sabbath School Instruction,	97
Rev. Edward W. Gilman, Stonington, Conn.	
VII. Government in the United States,	110
Hon. Thomas B. Osborne, New Haven.	
VIII. Sheol; Hades; The Invisible State,	125
Rev. Eleazar T. Fitch, D. D., Yale College.	
IX. The Late President Wayland,	135
Professor Fisher, Yale College.	
X. The Reformation of the South,	143
Rev. W. T. Eustis, New Haven.	

ARTICLE XI.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL.	
FISHER, (GEO. P.)—Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christ- ianity,	159
BUSHNELL, (HORACE).—The Vica- rious Sacrifice,	160
LECKY, (W. E. H.)—History of Rationalism,	162
HURST, (JOHN F.)—History of Ra- tionalism,	163
SMITH, (W.)—Concise Dictionary of the Bible,	164
PHILOSOPHICAL.	
MILL, (JOHN STUART).—Disserta- tions and Discussions,	166
MILL, (JOHN STUART).—The Posi- tive Philosophy of Auguste Comte,	168

BIOGRAPHICAL.		MARCH, (FRANCIS A.)—Method of	
BROOKE, (S. A.)—Life and Letters		Philological Study of the En-	
of Frederic W. Robertson, -	168	glish Language, -	174
BEETS, (N.)—Life and Character		SMITH, (ALEXANDER).—A Summer	
of J. H. Van der Palm, D. D., -	169	in Skye, -	174
MISCELLANEOUS.		CHILD, (L. MARIA)—The Freed-	
KENNEDY, (JOHN P.)—Mr. Am-		men's Book, -	175
brose's Letters on the Rebel-		BROWNELL, (HENRY HOWARD).—	
lion, -	170	War Lyrics, -	175
Mr. Buchanan's Administration on		BARRETT, (ELIZABETH G. BARBER).	
the Eve of the Rebellion, -	170	—Poems, -	177
PERRY, (A. L.)—Elements of Polit-		Winifred Bertram, -	177
ical Economy, -	172	Every Saturday, -	177
HOLLAND, (J. G.)—Plain Talk on		Our Young Folks, -	178
Familiar Subjects, -	178	Publications of Sever & Francis, -	178
		Books Received, -	178

No. II.

ART. I. The New Era, -	179
President Woolsey, Yale College.	
II. Systematic Training for the Ministry, -	200
Professor Fisher, Yale College.	
III. A Biographer at Work, -	218
IV. Review of Dr. Bushnell on "The Vicarious	
Sacrifice," -	228
Professor Noah Porter, Yale College.	
V. Review of Rev. Dr. Beardsley's "History of	
the Episcopal Church in Connecticut," -	283
Rev. Dr. Bacon, New Haven.	
VI. Review of Mrs. L. H. Sigourney's "Letters of	
Life." -	330
VII. The Political Situation, -	359

ARTICLE VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.	MISCELLANEOUS.
Ellis on Philipians, Colossians,	Bowler's "Across the Continent,"
and Philemon, -	365
Dr. Spring's Reminiscences, -	369
Bishop Horatio Potter and his Re-	Whittier's "Snow Bound,"
spondents, -	377
Goulburn's "Devotional Study of	Works of Epictetus, -
the Holy Scriptures," -	390
	Alden's "Elements of Intellectual
	Philosophy," -
	390
	Buck's "Ecclesiastical Law of Mas-
	sachusetts," -
	405
	Lunt's "Origin of the Late War,"
	406
	Leonard Scott's Reprints of British
	Periodicals, -
	406
	Rebellion Record, -
	409
	Other New Publications, -
	406

No. III.

ART. I. The Relation of Thought to Language, - -	411
Prof. E. D. Sanborn, Hanover, New Hampshire.	
II. Divorce Legislation, - - -	436
Rev. H. Loomis, Jr., North Manchester, Conn.	
III. The Episcopal Church in New England: A Review of Dr. Harwood's Sermon at the Semi-centennial celebration of the Consecra- tion of Trinity Church, New Haven, - -	454
Rev. Dr. Bacon, New Haven.	
IV. Review of Professor Fisher's Life of Benjamin Silliman, - - - - -	508
Professor Dwight, Yale College.	
V. Review of Dr. Pusey's "Eirenicon," and the Replies of Manning and Newman, - -	536
Professor Fisher, Yale College.	
VI. Review of Renan's New Work on the Apostles, -	542
Professor Fisher, Yale College.	

ARTICLE VII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

Rece Homo, - - -	563
Fairbairn on Prophecy, - -	565
Lange's Critical, Doctrinal, and Ho- miletical Commentary.—Vol. II.	
Mark and Luke, - - -	565
Whedon's Commentary on Luke and John, - - -	566
The Person of Christ. By Rev. Dr. Schaff, - - -	567
The Shadow of Christianity, -	567
Goulburn's "Idle Word," - -	568
Ingham on Baptism, - - -	569
Sermons of Rev. Francis Baker, with a Memoir of his Life. By Rev. A. F. Hewit, - - -	569
Jehovah-Jireh. A Treatise on Prov- idence. By Rev. Dr. W. S. Plumer, - - -	572
Views of Prophecy, - - -	576

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.

Rush's Analysis of the Human In- tellect, - - -	578
Mind in Nature. By Prof. H. J. Clark, - - -	581
Essays: Philosophical and Theo- logical. By James Martineau, -	582

An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy. By Rev. Dr. James McCosh, - - -	583
Herbert Spencer's "Principles of Biology," - - -	584

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL.

Froude's History of England: From the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth, - - -	585
Brownson on the American Re- public, - - -	587

MISCELLANEOUS.

Complete Works of Archbishop Hughes, - - -	591
Agassiz' Geological Sketches, -	592
The South Since the War. By S. Andrews, - - -	593
The Queen Mother and Rosamond. By Algernon Charles Swinburne, -	594
Esperance, - - -	594
The Restoration. By Rev. H. Riley, - - -	596
Rebellion Record, - - -	596
Reprints of the British Reviews, -	596
Recent Publications, - - -	596

No. IV.

ART. I. The Relations of Art to Education,	-	-	601
Professor Hoppin, Yale College.			
II. Contemporary England. A Review of Miss Martineau's History of England during the Peace,	-	-	618
Theodore Bacon, Esq., Rochester, New York.			
III. The Political Preaching of Christ and his Apostles. A Review of Judge Black's Letter to Rev. Alfred Nevin, D. D., on "Political Preaching,"	-	-	658
H. T. Blake, Esq., New Haven.			
IV. Mr. Mitchell's Novel, "Dr. Johns,"	-	-	679
Professor Fisher, Yale College.			
V. Dr. Hedge's Address to the Alumni of Harvard,	695		
President Woolsey, Yale College.			
VI. President Johnson's Tour, and his Policy,	-	-	711

ARTICLE VII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.		HISTORICAL.	
The Rise and the Fall; or, the Origin of Moral Evil,	729	History of the United States, from the Discovery of the American Continent. Vol. IX,	751
Orthodoxy: its Truths and Errors. By James Freeman Clarke,	734	The Conversion of the Northern Nation. By Charles Merivale, B. D.,	754
Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church. Part II. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley,	738	History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin. Vol. IV.,	755
History of Congregationalism from about A. D. 250, to the Present Time. By George Punchard,	739		
Méditations sur l'état actuel de la Religion Chrétienne. Par M Guizot,	742	MISCELLANEOUS.	
Short Sermons to Newsboys. By Charles Loring Brace,	743	Stephen A. Douglas on Constitutional and Party Questions,	756
The Book of Worship. Compiled by Rev. Leonard W. Bacon,	744	Sherbrooke,	758
A Commentary on the Minor Prophets. By Henry Cowles,	748	Hon. A. D. White's Phi Beta Kappa Address,	758
		New Publications,	759

INDEX.

In this Index the names of Contributors of Articles are printed in Italics.

- | | | | |
|--|-----|--|-----|
| Adams, (Samuel), W. V. Wells's, Life of noticed, . . . | 391 | fred Nevin, July 25th, 1866, reviewed, by <i>H. T. Blake</i> , . . . | 653 |
| Agassiz, (Louis), Geological Sketches, noticed, . . . | 592 | <i>Blake, (H. T.)</i> , Political Preaching of Christ and his Apostles. Review of Judge Black's Letter to Rev. Alfred Nevin, . . . | 653 |
| Agassiz, (Louis), Graham Lectures on the Structure of Animal Life, noticed, . . . | 402 | Bowles, (Samuel), Across the Continent, noticed, . . . | 400 |
| Aitchison, (William), Charles P. Bush's Life of, noticed, . . . | 394 | Brace, (Charles Loring), Short Sermons to Newsboys, noticed, . . . | 743 |
| Alden, (Joseph), Elements of Intellectual Philosophy, noticed, . . . | 405 | Brooke, (S. A.), Life and Letters of Frederic W. Robertson, noticed, . . . | 168 |
| Andrews, (Sidney), The South Since the War, noticed, . . . | 598 | Brownell, (Henry Howard), War Lyrics, noticed, . . . | 175 |
| Arnold, (Matthew), Lectures "On Translating Homer," contained in "Essays in Criticism," reviewed by <i>Louis R. Packard</i> , . . . | 47 | Brownson, (O. A.), The American Republic, noticed, . . . | 587 |
| Art and its Relations to Education, <i>J. M. Hoppin</i> , Article, . . . | 601 | Buchanan's (President), Administration on the eve of the Rebellion, noticed, . . . | 170 |
| Bacon, (Leonard), Review of Dr. Beardsley's History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, . . . | 283 | Buck, (Edward), Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law, noticed, . . . | 405 |
| Bacon, (Leonard), The Episcopal Church in New England. A review of Dr. Harwood's Sermon at the Semi-Centennial Celebration of the Consecration of Trinity Church, New Haven, . . . | 454 | Bush, (Charles P.), Life of William Aitchison, noticed, . . . | 394 |
| Bacon, (Leonard W.), The Book of Worship, noticed, . . . | 744 | Bushnell, (Horace), The Vicarious Sacrifice, noticed, . . . | 160 |
| Bacon, (Theodore), Review of Miss Martineau's History of England during the Peace, . . . | 618 | Bushnell, (Horace), The Vicarious Sacrifice, reviewed, by <i>Noah Porter</i> , . . . | 228 |
| Baker, (Francis A.), Sermons and Memoir of, noticed, . . . | 569 | Canfield (E. H.), Reply to Bishop Potter's Pastoral Letter, noticed, . . . | 382 |
| Bancroft, (George), History of the United States, Volume IX, noticed, . . . | 751 | Child, (L. Maria), The Freedmen's Book, noticed, . . . | 175 |
| Barrett, (Elizabeth G. Barber), Poems, noticed, . . . | 177 | Clark, (Henry James), Mind in Nature, noticed, . . . | 581 |
| Beardsley, (E. Edwards), History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, reviewed, by <i>Leonard Bacon</i> , . . . | 283 | Clarke, (James Freeman), The Truths and Errors of Orthodoxy, noticed, . . . | 734 |
| Beets, (N.), Life and Character of J. H. Van der Palm, noticed, . . . | 169 | Congregationalism, G. Punchard's History of, noticed, . . . | 739 |
| Biographer, A., at Work. Article, Black, (J. S.), Letter on "Political Preaching" in reply to Rev. Al- | 218 | Connecticut, Divorce Legislation in, <i>H. Loomis</i> , Article, . . . | 486 |
| | | Cornelius O'Dowd's Contributions to Blackwood's Magazine, on the Slaveholder's Rebellion, noticed, . . . | 407 |
| | | Cowles, (Henry), Commentary on the Minor Prophets, noticed, . . . | 748 |
| | | D'Aubigné's History of the Reformation in Europe, noticed, . . . | 755 |
| | | Derby, (Earl), Iliad of Homer ren- | |

- dered into blank verse, reviewed,
 by *Louis R. Packard*, . . . 47
 Divorce Legislation in Connecticut,
 Article, by *H. Loomis*, . . . 436
 Douglas, (Stephen A.), On Constitutional
 and Party Questions, not-
 iced, . . . 756
 Dr. Johns, reviewed, by *G. P.
 Fisher*, . . . 679
 Draper, (John William), Thoughts
 on the Future Civil Policy of
 America, reviewed, by *I. N. Tar-
 boz*, . . . 26
Dwight, (*Timothy*), Review of Mrs.
 L. H. Sigourney's "Letters of
 Life," . . . 380
Dwight, (*Timothy*), Review of Prof.
 Fisher's Life of Prof. Silliman, . . . 508
Ecce Homo, noticed, . . . 563
 Education and its Relations to Art,
J. M. Hoppin, Article, . . . 601
 Education, University. Dr. Hedge's
 Address to the Alumni of Har-
 vard, reviewed, by *T. D. Woolsey*, . . . 695
 Elliott, (C. J.), Commentary on
 Philippians, Colossians, and
 Philemon, noticed, . . . 365
 England. (Contemporary) Review
 of Miss Martineau's History of
 England during the Peace, *Theo-
 dore Bacon*, . . . 618
 England, Country Life in, Article,
 by *A. D. Gridley*, . . . 1
 Epictetus, Thomas Wentworth Hig-
 ginson's edition of the Works of,
 noticed, . . . 404
 Episcopal Church in New England.
 Review of Dr. Harwood's Semi-
 centennial Sermon, *L. Bacon*, . . . 454
 Esperance, noticed, . . . 594
 Eustis, (W. T.), Discourse delivered
 at the Funeral of Rev. Samuel
 Fisk, reviewed by *Burdett Hart*, . . . 75
Eustis, (W. T.), The Reformation
 of the South, Article, . . . 148
 Every Saturday, noticed, . . . 177
 Expository Preaching, Article, by
E. C. Jones, . . . 65
 Fairbairn, (Patrick), Prophecy
 Viewed in respect to its Distinc-
 tive Nature, &c., noticed, . . . 565
 Fall, The Rise and the; or, the Ori-
 gin of Moral Evil, noticed, . . . 729
Fisher, (*George P.*), The late Pres-
 ident Wayland, Article, . . . 135
Fisher, (*George P.*), Systematic
 Training for the Ministry, Article, . . . 200
Fisher (*George P.*), The Political
 Situation, Article, . . . 359
Fisher, (*George P.*), Review of Dr.
 Pusey's "Eirenicon," and the Re-
 plies of Manning and Newman, . . . 536
Fisher, (*George P.*), Review of Re-
 nan's Work on the Apostles, . . . 542
Fisher, (*George P.*), Review of D. G.
 Mitchell's Novel, "Dr. Johns," . . . 679
Fisher, (*George P.*), Essays on the
 Supernatural Origin of Christian-
 ity, noticed, . . . 159
Fisher, (*George P.*), Life of Profes-
 sor Silliman, reviewed, by *Tim-
 othy Dwight*, . . . 508
 Fisk, (Samuel), Sketch of the Life
 of, Article, by *Burdett Hart*, . . . 75
Fitch, (*E. T.*), Sheol; Hades; the
 Invisible State, Article, . . . 125
 Frothingham, (Richard), Life of Jo-
 seph Warren, noticed, . . . 392
 Froude, (James Anthony), History
 of England, Vols. V. and VI., not-
 iced, . . . 585
Gilman, (*Edward W.*), Sabbath
 School Instruction, Article, . . . 97
 Goulburn, (Edward Meyrick), Devo-
 tional Study of the Holy Scrip-
 ture, noticed, . . . 390
 Goulburn, (E. M.), The Idle Word,
 noticed, . . . 568
 Government in the United States,
 Article, by *Thomas B. Osborne*, . . . 110
Gridley, (*A. D.*), Country Life in
 England, Article, . . . 1
 Guizot. Reflections upon the Pres-
 ent State of the Christian Reli-
 gion, noticed, . . . 742
 Hades; Sheol; the Invisible State,
 Article, by *E. T. Fitch*, . . . 125
Hart, (*Burdett*), Sketch of the Life
 of Samuel Fisk, Article, . . . 75
 Harwood, (Edwin), Semi-centennial
 Sermon, reviewed, by *Leonard
 Bacon*, . . . 454
 Hawthorne, (Nathaniel), Our Old
 Home, reviewed, by *A. D. Grid-
 ley*, . . . 1
 Hedge, (Dr.), Address to the Alum-
 ni of Harvard, reviewed, by *T.
 D. Woolsey*, . . . 695
 Hewit, (A. F.), Memoir of the Rev.
 Francis A. Baker, noticed, . . . 569
 Higginson, (T. W.), Edition of the
 Works of Epictetus, noticed, . . . 404
 Holland, (J. G.), Plain Talk on
 Familiar Subjects, noticed, . . . 173
Hoppin, (*J. M.*), Relations of Art
 to Education, Article, . . . 601
 Howitt, (William), The Rural Life
 of England, reviewed, by *A. D.
 Gridley*, . . . 1

Hughes, (John), Complete Works, noticed, . . .	591	Mitchell, (Donald G.), Dr. Johns, reviewed, by <i>G. P. Fisher</i> , . . .	679
Hurst, (John F.), History of Rationalism, noticed, . . .	163	Moral Evil, Origin of, noticed, . . .	729
Ingham, (R.), Handbook on Baptism, noticed, . . .	569	Muhlenberg, (W. A.), Reply to Bishop Potter's Pastoral Letter, noticed, . . .	389
Jehovah-Jireh, noticed, . . .	572	New Era, The, Article, by <i>T. D. Woolsey</i> , . . .	179
Johnson, (President), His Tour and his Policy, Article, . . .	711	Newman, (John Henry), Letter to Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., on his recent Eirenicon, reviewed, by <i>G. P. Fisher</i> , . . .	536
Jones, (<i>E. C.</i>), Expository Preaching, Article, . . .	65	Orthodoxy; its Truths and Errors, by James Freeman Clarke, noticed, . . .	734
Kennedy, (John P.), Mr. Ambrose's Letters on the Rebellion, noticed, . . .	170	<i>Osborne, (Thomas B.)</i> , Government in the United States, . . .	110
Knox, (Charles E.), A Year with St. Paul, reviewed, by <i>Edward W. Gilman</i> , . . .	97	Our Young Folks, . . .	178
Knox, (Charles E.), Graduated Sunday School Text-Books, reviewed, by <i>Edward W. Gilman</i> , . . .	97	Owen, (Robert), Life of, noticed, . . .	399
Lange, (John Peter), Commentary, Vol. II., Mark and Luke, noticed, . . .	565	<i>Packard, (Louis R.)</i> , Lord Derby and Professor Arnold on Homer, Article, . . .	47
Language, The Relation of Thought to, Article, by <i>E. D. Sanborn</i> , . . .	411	Palmer, (Ray), Sermon on "The Highest Civilization a Result of Christianity and Christian Learning, noticed, . . .	409
Lecky, (W. E. H.), History of Rationalism, noticed, . . .	162	Perry, (A. L.), Elements of Political Economy, noticed, . . .	172
Letters of Life, by Mrs. L. H. Signourney, reviewed, by <i>Timothy Dwight</i> , . . .	380	Plumer, (W. S.), Jehovah-Jireh, A Treatise on Providence, noticed, . . .	572
Loomis, (H.), Divorce Legislation in Connecticut, Article, . . .	486	Political Situation, April, 1866, Article, by <i>G. P. Fisher</i> , . . .	359
Lunt, (George), Origin of the Late War, noticed, . . .	406	<i>Porter, (Noah)</i> , Review of Dr. Bushnell on the "Vicarious Sacrifice," . . .	228
Man's Place in Nature, Dr. Draper's Views respecting, criticised, by <i>I. N. Tarbox</i> , . . .	29	Potter, (Horatio), Pastoral Letter of, noticed, . . .	377
March, (Francis A.), Method of Philological Study of the English Language, noticed, . . .	174	Preaching, Expository, Article, by <i>E. C. Jones</i> , . . .	65
Martineau, (Harriet), History of England during the Peace, reviewed, by <i>Theodore Bacon</i> , . . .	618	Preaching, Political, Review of Judge Black's Letter to Rev. Alfred Nevin, by <i>H. T. Blake</i> , . . .	653
Martineau, (James), Essays: Philosophical and Theological, noticed, . . .	582	Prophecy, Views of, concerning the Jews, the Second Advent, and the Millennium, noticed, . . .	576
M'Cosh, (James), An Examination of Mr. John Stuart Mill's Philosophy, noticed, . . .	583	Punchard, (George), History of Congregationalism, noticed, . . .	739
Merivale, (Charles), The Conversion of the Northern Nations, noticed, . . .	754	Pusey, (E. B.), An Eirenicon, reviewed, by <i>G. P. Fisher</i> , . . .	536
Merle, (D'Aubigne), History of the Reformation in Europe, noticed, . . .	755	Rebellion Record, noticed, . . .	409, 596
Ministry, Systematic Training for the, Article, by <i>George P. Fisher</i> , . . .	200	Renan, (Ernest), The Apostles, reviewed, by <i>G. P. Fisher</i> , . . .	542
Mill, (John Stuart), Dissertations and Discussions, noticed, . . .	166	Riley, (Henry), The Restoration, noticed, . . .	596
Mill, (John Stuart), On the Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte, noticed, . . .	168	Rise (The) and Fall; or the Origin of Moral Evil, noticed, . . .	729
		Robertson, (F. W.), S. A. Brooke's Life and Letters of, noticed, . . .	168
		Rush, (James), Brief Outline of an Analysis of the Human Intellect, noticed, . . .	578

- Sabbath School Instruction, Article, by *Edward W. Gilman*, . . . 97
- Sanborn*, (*E. D.*), The Relation of Thought to Language, Article, . . . 411
- Schaff, (*P.*), The Person of Christ, noticed, . . . 567
- Scott, (*Leonard*), Reprints of the British Periodicals, noticed, 406, 596
- Shadow of Christianity, noticed, . . . 567
- Sheol; Hades, The Invisible State, Article, by *E. T. Fitch*, . . . 125
- Sherbrooke, noticed, . . . 758
- Sigourney, (*Mrs. L. H.*), Letters of Life, reviewed, by *Timothy Dwight*, . . . 380
- Silliman, (*B.*), Prof. Fisher's Life of, reviewed, by *Timothy Dwight*, . . . 508
- Smith, (*Alexander*), A Summer in Skye, noticed, . . . 174
- Smith, (*W.*), Concise Dictionary of the Bible, noticed, . . . 164
- Smith, (*John Cotton*), Reply to Bishop Potter's Pastoral Letter, noticed, . . . 385
- South, The Reformation of the, Article, by *W. T. Eustis*, . . . 143
- Spring, (*Gardiner*), Reminiscences, noticed, . . . 369
- Spencer, (*Herbert*), The Principles of Biology, noticed, . . . 584
- Stanley, (*A. P.*), Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church, Part II., noticed, . . . 738
- Stevens, (*Abel*), The Centenary of American Methodism, noticed, . . . 410
- Swinburne, (*Agernon Charles*), The Queen Mother and Rosamond, noticed, . . . 594
- Tarbox*, (*J. N.*), Review of Dr. Draper's "Thoughts on the future Civil Policy of America," . . . 26
- Tyler, (*W. S.*), Discourse delivered at the Funeral of Rev. Samuel Fisk, reviewed, by *Burdett Hart*, . . . 75
- Tyng, (*S. H.*), Reply to Bishop Potter's Pastoral Letter, noticed, 378
- United States, Government in the, Article, by *Thomas B. Osborne*, . . . 110
- Van der Palm, (*J. H.*), N. Beets' Life and Character of, noticed, . . . 169
- Wayland, (*Francis*), The Elements of Moral Science, noticed, . . . 597
- Wayland, (*Francis*), The late President of Brown University, Article, by *G. P. Fisher*, . . . 135
- Warren, (*Joseph*), Richard Frothingham's Life of, noticed, . . . 392
- Wells, (*W. V.*), Life of Samuel Adams, noticed, . . . 391
- Westminster, (*Archbishop of*), The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost, noticed, by *G. P. Fisher*, 536
- Westminster, (*Archbishop of*), Pastoral Letter on the "Reunion of Christendom," reviewed, by *G. P. Fisher*, . . . 536
- Whedon, (*D. D.*), Commentary, Vol. II., Luke and John, noticed, 566
- White, (*Andrew D.*), Phi Beta Kappa Address, Yale College, July 25, 1866, noticed, . . . 758
- Whittier, (*John Greenleaf*), Snow Bound, noticed, . . . 404
- Winifred Bertram, noticed, . . . 177
- Woolsey, (*T. D.*), The New Era, Article, . . . 179
- Woolsey, (*T. D.*), Review of Dr. Hedge's Address to the Alumni of Harvard, on University Education, . . . 695

TO THE READERS OF
THE NEW ENGLANDER.

WITH the next (April) number there will commence a new arrangement in the conduct of the New Englander. From that time this Journal will be under the editorial care and management of Professor GEORGE P. FISHER, Professor TIMOTHY DWIGHT, and WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY, Esq.

These gentlemen are permitted to count upon the efficient coöperation of President WOOLSEY, DR. BACON, Professor PORTER, and the other writers, to whose exertions the New Englander has mainly owed its power and usefulness.

Twenty-three years ago the founders of the New Englander set forth in their "Prolegomena" the ends they had in view in establishing this Journal, and the spirit in which they proposed to conduct it. They were to inculcate and defend the ideas of religion and of human rights which are vital to the Christianity of New England, and, at the same time, to foster the interests of a sound literature by the publication of essays and criticisms. They were not to publish an exclusively theological Review, but they included in their plan the discussion of political and social questions, and shut out no subject of public interest on which educated Congregationalists might desire to speak. They disclaimed allegiance to any party in religion or politics, and signified the independent spirit in which they proposed to act, by adopting for their motto the Horatian line, "*Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.*" While they would allow some diversity of opinion to appear on

their pages, they informed the public that the influence of the New Englander would be found "setting in one direction." It would "be found on the side of order, of freedom, of progress, of simple and spiritual Christianity, and of the Bible as the infallible, sufficient, and only authority in religion."

It may be said without presumption, that the expectation which was raised by the original announcement of the New Englander has not been disappointed. In the long struggle with the Slave Power in this country, which has just terminated in a signal victory, this Journal has perseveringly contended, through good report and evil report, on the side of liberty, and in opposition to the machinations and open assaults of those who strove to make slavery a national institution. The New Englander has firmly maintained the good cause when no inconsiderable portion of the Northern clergy either directly favored schemes of dangerous compromise, or halted between two opinions. The literary discussions which have appeared on its pages, have often been of a high order of merit, and the influence of the New Englander in this respect has been in the right direction. The particular features, claims, and obligations of the Congregational denomination have not been neglected; and it is believed that nowhere can a better description and defense of our polity and distinguishing principles be found, than on the pages of this Journal. At the same time, the New Englander has endeavored to keep clear of the spirit of sect. It has entered into the great controversy of our common Christianity with Rationalism, not by publishing invectives and empty warnings against error, but by candid, searching discussions, by an exposure of the fallacious reasoning of unbelievers, and by representing the doctrines of the Gospel in such a light as to remove prejudice and misconception.

The plan of the New Englander will remain unchanged. But it is hoped that a larger outlay of editorial labor will enable it more effectually to realize its aims. The expiration of nearly a quarter of a century since its origin, and especially the great turn-

ing-point at which we have arrived in our national history, appear to afford a fit occasion for our Journal to gather up its energies for a fresh start. The new era of national life on which we are entering will call for the wise and earnest consideration of many questions pertaining to politics and social reform. There is, besides, ample room in this country for a higher sort of political discussion, which is rarely met with. The proper function of the State, the relation of religion and the church to government, the true theory of political rights—under which the right of suffrage is one subordinate topic—are some of the subjects which belong to political philosophy, but respecting which there is a lamentable want of thorough discussion. The proper sphere of legislation in repressing vices like intemperance, and the character of our laws on the subject of divorce, with the duties consequently imposed upon ministers, are among the themes to which more careful inquiry must be directed.

In religion, the controversy with the different forms of Rationalism, some of which have adopted the policy of reserve, and expect to insinuate artfully what they cannot hope to inculcate directly, was never more interesting or more important. The late National Council has awakened a new attention to the condition and prospects of the Congregational denomination. Not only is our polity to be canvassed and defined afresh, but there are grave questions relating to the Christian Life, to the subject of Amusements, for example, and to Worship, which are in danger of receiving less consideration than, from their relative importance, they deserve. Our necessities and faults are to be pointed out, as well as our virtues lauded.

The departments of Literature and Philosophy will continue to receive their due share of attention. The current books will be examined in the spirit of impartial but courteous criticism. Particular efforts will be made to render the critical notices of new works valuable for their fullness and thoroughness.

For the contents of the New Englander, the Editors alone will

be responsible. They will allow, as heretofore has been the practice, diversities of opinion within a reasonable limit; but on questions of importance, the *New Englander* will take distinct ground, and what that ground, in each case, shall be, the Editors will determine.

It is not doubted that the old friends of the *New Englander* will be disposed to sustain it liberally both by subscribing individually and by exerting themselves still further to extend the subscription list. If our wealthy laymen could read the letters which are not unfrequently received from clergymen—some of them in distant parts of the country—who deplore the necessity, under which they are placed by poverty, of giving up this Journal to which they profess the strongest attachment, some means could be devised of saving them from this sacrifice.

GEORGE P. FISHER,
TIMOTHY DWIGHT,
WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY.

As the arrangement indicated above will not commence till after the appearance of the January number, new subscribers can begin with the April number if they prefer to do so. The price of subscription for the year is \$4;—for those who commence with the April number, \$3.

All communications of every kind, relating to the *New Englander*, are to be addressed to WILLIAM L. KINGSLEY, 63 *Grove street, New Haven*.

For further information, see page 7 of the *New Englander Advertiser*.

T H E

NEW ENGLANDER.

No. XCIV.

JANUARY, 1866.

ARTICLE I.—COUNTRY LIFE IN ENGLAND.

The Rural Life of England. By WILLIAM HOWITT. 2 Vols.
Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1854.

Our Old Home: A Series of English Sketches. By NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1863.

It is not strange that Americans incline to think and speak much of England and her people, for whatever concerns that nation largely concerns us. Notwithstanding the rough treatment we have lately received at her hands, we cannot forget that she is the mother country. We are bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh. Whatever is ancient and renowned in her history, whatever the extent of her empire, the wisdom and justice of her laws, or the splendor of her achievements in art and literature,—all is, in a sense, our property, and may justify in us some measure of family pride. It is of our English cousins that we now propose to speak, and of them more especially as living in the country; for it is here that they are

most at home, and appear to the best advantage. In the city, they become cosmopolitan and common-place; it is in the country that they retain most of their national peculiarities.

An intelligent American, turning his eyes toward England, will ever take into his view her history. Living in a new country, and surrounded by whatsoever is recent, he must be deeply impressed with her age; not, indeed, the hoary antiquity of Egypt or Greece, but, as compared with his own country, a nation venerable with years. In the mists which envelop her earliest history, he sees shadowy forms of the old Phœnicians, sea-faring people, hovering around her shores, trafficking with the nations for tin and lead; and when these mists blow away, he finds veritable traces of these bold Eastern men, in their Druidical temples, older than the Christian era. He finds, dating a few centuries later, the remains of Roman forts, bridges, walls, and military roads, built when Rome was mistress of the world. He thinks the plowman must be very dull if he does not reflect for how many years the same soil has been turned up to the sun, and how long it has been the theatre of active human life; that the boatman on the Thames must be very stupid who does not reflect how many times those waters have been cut by British keels, and how grand a part British commerce has played in the world's civilization.

Nor can it be forgotten that the lives of her kings have been largely associated with the country; for over its hills and plains many of them have swept with their armies; in its forests they have hunted; in its parks and gardens they have sought recreation; and in the affection and loyalty of its inhabitants they have taken special delight, and found the firmest pillar of their throne. Not only kings and queens, but the names of lords and ladies, statesmen, warriors, poets, and scholars, are everywhere linked with rural traditions. In yonder forest, King Rufus fell before Tyrrel's arrow; this one still resounds to the tread of Robin Hood and his merry men. It was on this beach of Southampton, that the waves humbled the pride of Canute. Here is Edgehill, the scene of the first encounter between Charles and the parliamentary forces, and

hard by is the house where Cromwell lodged on the night before the battle. Of modern kings, from Henry the Eighth to the present reigning family, nearly all have been munificent patrons of agriculture and gardening.

On yonder hill are the ruins of Ludlow castle, where Milton's "Comus" was first performed; and by this placid stream is Wilton Hall, amid whose bowers Sir Philip Sydney composed his "Arcadia." In a little rude building at Stratford, was the early home of Shakespeare. In Wolthorpe, Newton was born, and in one of its fortunate orchards saw the famous apple fall.* It is remarkable how almost every corner of the kingdom is associated with important deeds there done, or of eminent men who there lived and died. A writer has well observed that "the roll of England's great men is long, but it exhibits, for the most part, the names of great men and humble places. * * * Many roof-trees throughout the country are thus made beautiful and imposing, even with their thatch and tiles." Now in this roll are very many of the best minds that the world has ever seen; they have left a deep impression on the fortunes of the race; and it stirs one's blood to walk the soil once trodden by their feet, and to visit the graves where their dust reposes.

The remains of ancient architecture in England greatly impress a visitor from the New World. Here are castles, abbeys, and cathedrals, eight and nine centuries old. Many of them are in partial decay, covered with moss and ivy, yet enough has been preserved to illustrate the eminent genius and lofty purpose of the builders. For the sacred edifices it is claimed that the religious sentiment inspired them, just as it led to the crusades, to the translation of the Bible, and taught resistance to tyrants.

"The hand that rounded Peter's dome,
And groined the aisles of Christian Rome,
Wrought in sad sincerity;
Himself from God he could not free;

* We understand that the identical pippin is still shown the credulous visitor, or a consideration.

He buildd better than he knew :—
The conscious stone to beauty grew.

• • • • •
"O'er England's abbeyes bends the sky,
As on its friends with kindred eye;
For out of Thought's interior sphere,
These wonders rose to upper air;
And Nature gladly gave them place,
Adopted them into her race,
And granted them an equal date
With Andes and with Ararat."

Whether or not we admit this religious inspiration, mixed with some earthly alloy, we cannot fail to look upon these old structures with reverence.

Less ancient than these, yet dating back several centuries, are the old country-houses, scattered through every part of the kingdom. William Howitt speaks of them in this affectionate way :

"How delightful it is to go through those hereditary abodes of ancient and distinguished families, and to see, in the very construction of them, images of the past times, and their modes of existence! Here, you pass through ample courts, amid rambling and extensive offices that once were necessary to the jolly establishment of the age,—for hounds, horses, hawks, and all their attendants and dependencies. Here you come into vast kitchens, with fire-places at which three or four oxen might be roasted at once, with mantelpieces wide as the arch of a bridge, and chimneys as large as the steeple of a country church. Then you advance into great halls, where scores of rude revelers have feasted in returning from battle or the chase, in the days of feudal running and riding, of foraging and pilgrimages, of hard knocks and hard lying; ere tea and coffee had supplanted beef and ale at breakfast; ere books had charmed away spears and targets. Then, again, you advance into tapestried chambers, on whose walls mythological or scriptural histories, wrought by the fingers of high-born dames, at once impress you with a sense of very still, and leisurely, and woodland times, when Crocksford's and Almack's were not; nor the active spirit of civilization had raised up weavers and spinners by thousands on thousands. And now you come to the very closets and bowers of the ladies themselves,—scenes of worn and faded splendor, but showing enough of their original state to mark their wide difference from the silken boudoirs and luxurious dormitories of the fair dames of this age. Then there is the antique chapel, and the library; the one having in most cases been deserted by its ancient faith, the other still bearing testimony to the range of reading of our old squires and nobles, since reading became a part of their education, in a few grim folios,—a Bible, a Gwillim's Heraldry, one or two

of our Chroniclers, and a few Latin classics or Fathers, for the enjoyment of the chaplain."*

He goes on to speak of the hall containing the armor, with its swords, helmets, coats of mail, ponderous boots, buff coats, huge spurs, crosses, and amulets. One suit of armor figured, he surmises, in the battles of Cressy and Poitiers; another in the wars of the Roses, and in the tourney of the Field of Cloth of Gold; and still another was scarred and broken on the ramparts of Ascalon and Jerusalem. And if these relics do not sufficiently bring up the past, we can step into the picture gallery beyond, and gaze upon the men who wore these habiliments, and on the fair dames who inspired half their courage.

Some of these old houses remain essentially as they were built: the antique furniture, the smoke-begrimed paintings, the family escutcheons, the rude utensils, the faded tapestry within; and without, the millennial oaks, and the geometrical gardens with their yews, topiary trees, and sun-dials. Many others have been thoroughly modernized, making them, indeed, more elegant and comfortable as family residences, but destroying their historic charm. Others, again, have been repaired and altered in part; the additions successively made being built and furnished in the style of their own age; and so the whole has become a rich mosaic for antiquarian study.

The country life of England has many poetical associations. Here, as often elsewhere, history and poetry so mingle as hardly to be distinguished. Poetry loves clond-land, and the early history of Britain lies largely in that realm. And when it is spread out in the open light of fact and certainty, English bards have delighted to invest it with a poetical interest. The mere names of British mountains, lakes, and rivers, call up deeds of bravery and romance. Her castles and halls are poems. Every aspect of nature has been sung in strains with which all who speak the English tongue are familiar. Irving's testimony here is most true:

* I, 894.

"The pastoral writers of other countries appear as if they had paid nature an occasional visit, and become acquainted with her general charms, but the British poets have lived and revelled with her; they have wooed her in her most secret haunts; they have watched her minutest caprices. A spray could not tremble in the breeze, a leaf could not rustle to the ground, a diamond drop could not patter in the stream, a fragrance could not exhale from the humble violet, nor a daisy unfold its crimson tints to the morning, but it has been noticed by these impassioned and delicate observers, and wrought up into some beautiful morality."

Cowley's Address to the Swallow, Parnell's Hermit, Thompson's Seasons, Goldsmith's Deserted Village, Cowper's Task;—the pages of Burns, Bloomfield, Wordsworth, Scott, and Coleridge, give us abundant pictures of rural scenes or allusions to the country in some of its numberless aspects. The very oaks of Britain, her hollies, yews, hawthorns, heaths, primroses, daisies, and harebells, grow and blossom in an atmosphere of poetry. The nightingale, cuckoo, lark, robin, linnet, sparrow, and thrush, warble in all the groves, and by all the streams of English literature. Nor, let it be forgotten, that the scene of that famous epic, *Cock Robin*, was laid in the country, and that here transpired the tragical history of *Little Red Riding Hood*. Whether *Old Mother Hubbard* lived in the country is not so clear, only it would seem that the poverty of her cupboard can be best explained by her supposed distance from a town market!

In enumerating the aspects of life in the country, mention must be made of the climate. So much abuse has been heaped upon the English climate, by travelers from other countries, that it would seem as though no good thing could be affirmed of it. "The night and day are too nearly of a color," says one. "You need a fire on the hearth every day of the year," adds another. "No fruit ripens there but a baked apple," chimes in a third. And all cry out against the sombre, sunless skies, the fog, the everlasting drizzle.

Yet something may be put down in its favor. It is milder by several degrees than would be inferred from its latitude. Compared with that of our own Northern States, or of Northern Europe, it is soft and equable.—a circumstance not so remarkable, perhaps, when we consider its insular position, and

the influence of the Gulf Stream flowing along its western shores.

The climate is quite humid, and it is to this and the absence of extreme cold that England owes that rich and almost perennial greenness of her vegetation which attracts the admiration of all foreigners. Hawthorne, in his "Old Home," makes frequent mention of this. He finds in the hedges a denser foliage and a richer greenness than in ours. The stone-walls by the roadside, which with us are bare and unsympathetic, are there covered with vines, mosses, and lichens. He is greatly charmed with the trunks of the old trees. He says:

"The parasitic growth is so luxuriant, that the trunk of the tree, so gray and dry in our climate, is better worth observing than the boughs and foliage; a verdant mossiness coats it all over, so that it looks almost as green as the leaves; and often, moreover, the stately stem is clustered about, high upward, with creeping and twining shrubs, the ivy, and sometimes the mistletoe, close-clinging friends, nurtured by the moisture and never too fervid sunshine, and supporting themselves by the old tree's abundant strength. * * * No bitter wind nips these tender little sympathies; no hot sun burns the life out of them; and therefore they outlast the longevity of the oak; and, if the woodman permitted, would bury it in a green grave when all is over."*

Of his visit to a country church-yard, near Leamington, he writes:—

"The English climate is very unfavorable to the endurance of memorials in the open air. Twenty years of it suffice to give as much antiquity of aspect, whether to tombstone or edifice, as a hundred years of our own drier atmosphere,—so soon do the drizzly rains and constant moisture corrode the surface of marble or free stone. Sculptured edges lose their sharpness in a year or two; yellow lichens overspread a beloved name, and obliterate it while it is fresh upon some survivor's heart. * * * And yet, this same ungenial climate, hostile as it generally is to the long remembrance of departed people, has sometimes a lovely way of dealing with the records on certain monuments that lie horizontally in the open air. The rain falls into the deep incisions of the letters, and has scarcely time to be dried away before another shower sprinkles the flat stone again, and replenishes those little reservoirs. The unseen, mysterious seeds of mosses find their way into the lettered furrows, and are made to germinate by the continual moisture and watery sunshine of the English sky; and by and by, in a year, or two years, or many years, behold the complete inscription—*'Here Tyth the Yodg'*—and all the rest of the tender falsehood—beautifully embossed in raised letters of living green, a bas-relief of velvet moss on the

* p. 108.

marble slab! It becomes more legible, under the skyey influences, after the world has forgotten the deceased, than when it was fresh from the stone-cutter's hands. It outlives the grief of friends. * * * * Perhaps the proverbial phrase, 'keep his memory green,' may have had its origin in the natural phenomenon here described."^e

Other travelers tell us that the prevailing humidity of the atmosphere softens the English landscape, toning down what would be light and brilliant with us; and giving the whole a hazy, dreamy indistinctness, much like that of our Indian summer.

Charles the First, who was quite fond of rural avocations, claimed for England that its climate "invited men abroad more days in the year, and more hours in the day, than that of any other country." In Southern Europe, the heat of summer is too intense for comfort, and in winter the weather is too changeable. In England, while there is less clearness and brilliancy in the sky, and less buoyancy in the atmosphere, the climate is comparatively temperate and uniform. At least, it does not enervate by its heat, nor depopulate by its malaria, nor prevent out-door labors and enjoyments by its excessive and long continued cold. Wheat is sown from October to April; the farmer's plow and the gardener's spade can be plied nearly every month of the year, and the pleasure seeker can be always abroad. The winter, less severe than ours, is also shorter. Its rigor is hardly felt until the middle of December, and in February the signs of spring appear.

Such a climate has no unimportant connection with the national health and happiness. It contributes to the vigor and robustness of the inhabitants, and not a little to their personal beauty. It is mild enough to attract men abroad, yet severe enough to brace their nerves, and render them active and strong. Horsemanship, whether as a genteel accomplishment, or for racing, hunting, traveling, Englishmen particularly like. When one gets worn down by dyspepsia, or hard study, or care, he takes to the saddle rather than to the doctor. Happily does Emerson declare of the English, that, "like the Arabs, they think the days spent in the chase are not counted

in the length of life. They box, run, shoot, ride, row, and sail, from pole to pole. They eat and drink, and live jolly in the open air, putting a bar of solid sleep between day and day."

Hence, in no small part, it happens that they are distinguished for their abundant healthfulness. The picture of an Englishman, in the middle and upper classes, to be true, will represent him as plump and hearty, and with a certain look of reserved strength. The Frenchman appears small and meagre beside him, and the American long, lank, and anxious. Then, too, the Englishman grows old well. His complexion is clear and ruddy till past threescore. And what is true of the men is hardly less so of the women; they are known the world over for their vigor and power of endurance. A walk of several miles does not put them out of breath, and the saddle is their favorite mode of riding. They may have less delicacy of complexion, less lightness and grace of form and carriage than their American cousins, but they bear the burden and heat of life better, and retain their freshness somewhat after "sweet sixteen." Mrs. Beecher Stowe speaks particularly of the ruddiness and vigor of Englishmen when past middle age: a man of sixty looking as young as one of fifty with us. The ladies, too, are radiant and blooming until the same period. She ascribes this partly to the sedative influence of the air, and to the absence of the many excitements which prevail in American society. She questions if there be not some conservative power in sea-fog, the same which keeps the turf green and makes the holly and ivy flourish. Hawthorne pushes the matter into the ludicrous when he speaks of the English lady of fifty as having "an awful ponderosity of frame, * * * massive with solid beef and streaky tallow. * * *

When she walks, her advance is elephantine. When she sits down, it is on a great round space of her Maker's footstool, where she looks as if nothing could ever move her," &c.* But, caricature aside, it is undeniably true, as a general fact, that the English people, in easy circumstances, are robust and healthy. And that this is largely due to the happily tempered

* p. 58.

climate of the country and the out-door habits of the people, can hardly admit of a doubt.

From the climate of England the transition is easy to its agriculture. Originally, the soil was much of it ungenial and barren; but by long continued industry it has been brought up to a fair measure of productiveness. Yet no ordinary husbandry could maintain it in that state for centuries, and not only so, but increase its fertility so that it would feed a rapidly augmenting population. This, however, has been done. The same acres, tilled and cropped, generation after generation, century after century, are richer to-day than at any former period. The land now feeds six millions of men better than it once did three millions. This result has been reached, not by any happy accident, but by skillful, well-applied labor.

One of the leading methods in this improved husbandry is draining. By this means, thousands of acres of low, marshy land, worthless to the farmer, and breeding disease to the inhabitants, have been brought into profitable cultivation. It has been applied, also, with beneficial results, to ordinary farmland. And it has been found there, as more recently here, that nearly all soils contain an excess of surface-water; that draining renders land warmer; protects grass and grain from injury in winter; lengthens the season of tillage and growth; makes the work of cultivation easier; and, in short, makes farming more profitable, often doubling the crops. This draining is performed in the most thorough manner,—the ditches being dug from three to six feet deep, and the tiles so laid as to conduct water effectually for a life-time. The best farms of England are filled with a net-work of such drains.

Side by side with this, has followed manuring. With such a constant and long continued cropping of the land as has been practised in England, for the last thousand years, the soil must long ago have been exhausted, had not great pains been taken to keep up its fertility. Few farms could obtain manure enough from their own resources, because a large portion of their crops was carried to the cities and villages for consumption. So, the cities and towns have been called upon for their

barn-refuse, their ashes, and soot, and street-sweepings, and and whatsoever else contained fertilizing material. Gypsum has been extensively used, likewise bones, fish, muck, and charcoal. The islands of the sea have been bidden to yield up their guano, and various artificial fertilizers have been manufactured, to aid in supplying the wants of the hungry earth. On many large estates, liquid manure is applied to the land by means of iron tubes laid under ground, the manure being forced through them by steam power, and distributed over the surface by gutta-percha hose.

Much skill has also been shown in the irrigation of the soil, thereby largely increasing the crops. Frederick Law Olmstead speaks of certain lands near Edinburgh, which were formerly barren wastes, but now, being irrigated by a stream into which the sewerage of the city flows, produce "such frequent and enormous crops of hay (ten cuttings in a season), that some portions of the land rent for \$100 a year for a single acre, and none for less than \$75 !"

That great improvement has been made in the modes of tillage, since the ancient Britons and Romans scratched the earth with a rude pick or pole, no one will doubt. The implements now in use are manifold, for plowing, clod-breaking, harrowing, rolling, planting, drilling, hoeing, reaping, threshing, and the various other operations of husbandry. About three hundred different implements are set down in their catalogues; and much of their machinery is driven by steam-power. We are aware that Brother Jonathan wins prizes at the World's Fairs for the lightness and thorough adaptation of many of his farm implements; but in other respects John Bull is still in advance of him.

No nation equals England in its sheep, cattle, and horses. Good blood and high breeding are at a premium in domestic animals as well as in human society. The raising of superior live-stock has long engaged the thoughts of leading minds, and has been reduced to a science. And along with the breeding of fine stock has grown up the extensive culture of root-crops for fattening them.

It is one peculiarity of English agriculture that, as a general

rule, the farmer does not own the land which he tills, but holds it by lease from some great proprietor. He rents it on certain conditions, such as the annual payment of a stipulated sum in money, or a certain proportion of the crops, the maintenance of the land in its average fertility, and the making of certain improvements. Oftentimes, the farmer himself is a man of considerable wealth, with numerous laborers under him, of whom he only takes the supervision. He corresponds to the "gentleman-farmer" of this country, and lives in a style of some elegance. At other times, he is a man of moderate means, and of limited education, but by hard labor and good management contrives to earn a livelihood, beside paying his rent to the landholder. This farmer, too, has a set of laborers in his employ, of whom he generally exacts the maximum of work for the minimum of wages. And here lies one of the most reprehensible features of the English agricultural system—the hireling is oppressed in his wages, and, as a consequence, is obliged to live upon scanty fare, in uncomfortable and unwholesome lodgings, and, in effect, is kept from generation to generation in a state of ignorance and servitude. Occasional efforts have been made by philanthropic men to introduce schools among the children of these laborers, but they have, for the most part, been frowned upon by the landholders and farmers, under the plea that education would spoil them for servants, at least if that education were carried further than the simplest rudiments of knowledge, and a few questions in the church catechism.

In still other cases, farms are managed by the owner and proprietor himself, however high his civil or social position. Many a British lord knows how to shear a sheep and hold a plow, and prides himself upon the knowledge. Agriculture seems to be a peculiarly genteel and dignified pursuit, if the farmer is so fortunate as to own the land on which he lives. Prince Albert himself was not ashamed to show a personal interest in Short Horns, South Downs, steam-plows, and rutabagas. Members of parliament, and the most high-born and wealthy citizens, are found annually competing for prizes at the cattle-shows. English ladies, too, even the highly educated

and delicately bred, are not too fastidious to interest themselves in the details of husbandry ; they seem to be born with a love of such things.

The large landholders, of whom we have spoken, have given much attention lately to the planting of the hilly and less productive portions of their estates with artificial forests. The native woods are fast disappearing, and they foresee that the land will soon become naked and desolate, unless something be done to re-clothe it. Hence, every year, the gentry may be seen engaged in the pleasant work of setting out groves, parks, and forests. And, indeed, so much has already been done, that many a barren and unsheltered tract has begun to smile with thickets and young woods. All sorts of native trees are used for this purpose, though the main reliance seems to be placed on the oak, larch, and pine, they being valuable for ornament and for use as timber. Mention is made of one lord who has planted his two thousand acres ; of the duke of Athol, his fifteen thousand, and the duke of Argyle, who has set about as many more. In this, among other ways, the mother country is managing to preserve her charms even to old age.

And this leads us to another topic, viz. rural embellishment. Devoted as are the English to agriculture, and the practically useful in its processes and results, they are yet equally interested in ornamental gardening, and the various arts which adorn country life. The whole kingdom is a garden, so thoroughly has its wildness been tamed, its rough places made smooth, and all its parts rendered subservient to the comfort of man. The natural scenery, as compared with that of Switzerland or New England, is flat and tame ; but art has so highly embellished it that its defects are seldom noticed.

The establishments of the rich present some of the finest specimens of landscape-gardening which the world has ever seen. And, indeed, in a country where such men as Repton, and Price, and Whateley, and London have lived, it were strange if such specimens could not be found. Each estate is shut in from the public road by a high stone fence, allowing only a few glimpses of itself through the bars of its iron

gates,—such is the Englishman's love of seclusion. Within these walls are parks, with herds of deer, cattle, and sheep. Here are velvet lawns, of a deep, perennial verdure, such as the British climate alone can furnish. Here are venerable trees of the rarest description, native and foreign, carefully guarded through several generations, and allowed time and room to develop themselves on every side. There are more Cedars of Lebanon now growing in England than in all Syria. The climate is so mild and uniform that a greater variety of trees and shrubs can be cultivated here than in any other country of the same extent. The law of primogeniture contributes greatly to the building up and preservation of fine country seats. The father projects and begins improvements upon his estate, knowing that what he leaves incomplete his son will finish, adding, also, the thoughts and labors of his life to the embellishment of the family homestead. Thus each residence comes to contain the accumulated treasures of several successive generations, and must, of necessity, acquire an amplitude of beauty and home-comfort not to be thought of in a country where the son seldom occupies the habitation of his father; or, as Hawthorne repiningly says, where we are discouraged in our building and planting, by "the idea that we must make our home warm and delightful for a miscellaneous race of successors, of whom the one thing certain is, that our own grandchildren will not be among them." Here, art and wealth combine to produce the finest possible effects in rural embellishment. Here are ancestral oaks, stately pines, and yews of unknown age. Here are gardens in which the shrubs, vines, and plants of all lands are assembled; conservatories filled with the rarest exotic flowers; glazed houses with tropical fruits ripening within them. Here are fountains, vases, statues. Here are mansions, spacious, substantial, elegant, the fit centres of such noble surroundings; and within them are sumptuous furniture, gold and silver plate, picture galleries, libraries, instruments of music, articles of *virtu*, family memorials, and whatever else can delight the eye and soul of man.

The poet Willis pencils a sketch of one of these fine country-seats in Scotland, which will answer well for England:

"The immense iron gate, surmounted by the Gordon arms; the handsome and spacious stone lodges on either side; the canonically fat porter, in white stockings and gray livery, lifting his hat as he swung open the massive portal, all bespoke the entrance to a noble residence. The road within was edged with velvet sward, and rolled to the smoothness of a terrace walk; the winding avenue lengthened away before me with trees of every variety of foliage; light carriages passed me driven by gentlemen or ladies, bound on their afternoon airing; a groom led up and down two beautiful blood horses, prancing along with side saddles and morocco stirrups; and keepers with hounds and terriers, gentlemen on foot, idling along the walks, and servants in different liveries, hurrying to and fro, betokened a busy scene of gayety before me. I had hardly noted these circumstances, before a sudden curve in the road brought the castle into view,—a vast, stone pile, with castellated wings. * * * As my chaise advanced to the door, a handsome boy, in a kind of page's dress, informed me that his Grace was out deer-shooting, but that my room was prepared, and he was ordered to wait on me. I followed him through a hall lined with statues, deers' horns, and armor, and was ushered into a large chamber looking out on a park, extending with its lawns and woods to the edge of the horizon. A more lovely view never feasted human eye. * * * Hill and valley lay spread before me; sheep fed in picturesque flocks, and small fallow deer grazed near them; the trees were planted and the distant forest shaped by the hand of taste; and broad and beautiful as was the expanse taken in by the eye, it was evidently one princely possession. A mile from the castle wall, the shaven sward extended in a carpet of velvet softness, as bright as emerald, studded by clumps of shrubbery, like flowers wrought elegantly in tapestry; and across it bounded occasionally a hare, and the pheasants fed undisturbed near the thickets, or a lady with flowing riding dress and flaunting feather, dashed into sight upon her fleet palfrey, and was lost the next moment in the woods. * * * And all this little world of enjoyment, and luxury, and beauty, lay in the hand of one man, and was created by his wealth in those northern wilds of Scotland, a day's journey almost from the possessions of another human being! I never realized so forcibly the splendid results of wealth and primogeniture."

With this glowing picture of modern life among the rural gentry, let us, for a moment, contrast the life of their feudal ancestors. The castles and halls in which they lived were floored and ceiled with oaken planks, and their furniture and domestic utensils were of the coarsest description. They had loop-holes for windows, large fireplaces for burning logs of wood, the floors were spread with rushes, and the walls were naked, cheerless, and blackened with smoke. In the scarcity of books, they solaced themselves with the lays of wandering minstrels, and with a variety of rustic games. Out of doors, everything was so exposed to pillage, that little was done in the way of planting gardens and trees.

In later years, when wars had ceased, and the taste for rural embellishments was allowed free scope, it developed itself in many ways which to our modern eyes seem peculiar. Then it was that the "topiary art" was introduced, and trees were sheared into the forms of men, animals, and birds. Shortly after this appeared the geometrical gardens, with triangles, trapezoids, and parallelograms, all bordered with box; stately terraces with balustrades and vases and classical figures on pedestals. A popular feature of the pleasure-ground at this time, also, was the *knot* or *labyrinth*, in which the paths were so intricately arranged that one might often walk half a day and yet not find the end at the centre. These were the gardens, says Howitt, "which Henry and Elizabeth admired, and in which our Surreys, Leicesters, Essexes,—the splendid nobles of the Tudor dynasty, the gay ladies and gallants of Charles the Second's court, had walked and talked, fluttered in glittering processions, or flirted in green alleys and bowers of topiary work; and amid figures in lead or stone, fountains, cascades, terraces, and curious quincunxes, obelisks, and pyramids,—fitting objects of the admiration of those who walked in high-heeled shoes, ruffs and fardingales, with fan in hand, or in trunk hose and laced doublets." The relics of these old-time pleasure-grounds remain unto this day, and happily illustrate the manners of the past. They were in keeping with the age in which they appeared, but what we see and know of them does not make us desire that they or their age should return.

We were speaking of modern country-seats: let us now go back from our digression. The palatial establishments of the aristocracy do by no means comprise all the beautiful homes in England. Among the abodes of the middle classes there are many which exhibit as much taste and refined culture, and doubtless enshrine as much happiness and personal worth, as the mansions of the titled and wealthy. They present many of the same features, though on a smaller scale. The houses, built in the rural Gothic or Italian style, are embowered in shrubbery and surrounded by shade-trees and gardens of fruits and flowers. The national fondness for hawthorn hedges, smooth lawns, hollies, laurels, rhododendrons, and conifers, here

display itself. Every wall, portico, and trunk of an old tree are covered with ivy and roses. The gravel walks are kept scrupulously neat, and the whole aspect of the homestead indicates comfort and repose. If any outward condition can keep away the heart-ache, it must be abodes like these, whose possessors are equally removed from poverty and riches.

The same love of rural embellishment pervades all classes. The cottages of the poor often exhibit taste in their diamond window-panes and clustered chimney-tops. The ivy and woodbine are trained up to the gables. There is the little grass-plot and flower-bed before the door, there is the holly-bush with its glossy leaves and Christmas berries, and the well-trimmed hedge. Who of us that has had occasion to employ English laborers, has not found that nearly every one has been gardener to some famous duke or noble lord, and so learned (or *thinks* he has) the arts of rural decoration? This wide-spread taste comes chiefly from the example and influence of cultivated men residing everywhere in the country.

The Englishman of whatever rank heartily loves rural life. If he happen to be born in the city, he is born with a taste for country scenes and occupations, and, on fit opportunity, takes to them with sincere relish. If compelled to spend his days in town, he manages to have a few trees and vines near his house, over which he watches with pious care; or, if he have the means for such enjoyment, he buys land enough for a garden in the suburbs of the city, where he revels amid fruits and flowers cultivated by his own hand. It is, however, in the open country that he feels most at home, and there he seeks to establish himself whenever he has sufficient wealth. A country seat well furnished is the height of his ambition. He likes to be styled one of "the country families," feeling that his respectability is not complete unless he is a landed proprietor. Hunting, boating, fishing, and other athletic exercises, added to the care of his estate, give him abundant employment. Within doors, he loves to collect all manner of comforts and elegancies. He visits London annually to see the sights, to purchase books and furniture and paintings, but his home is in the

country, and to the promotion of its comfort and respectability he devotes his chief thoughts.

To the topics already considered, we beg to add a few words touching the general intelligence of the country people, and their manners and customs. That the higher and middle classes are as well educated as men of corresponding condition in other countries, it would be superfluous here to affirm. Perhaps they are better educated, in some respects; but the common people and the very poor are often deplorably ignorant. It cannot be said there, as here, that the schoolmaster is abroad. And this lack of general intelligence is the more surprising when we consider how comparatively small the country is, and how long it has enjoyed the benefits of a high civilization. It is smaller than the State of Texas. It is studded with cities and villages; is webbed over with railways and turnpikes; wealth and art are widely diffused; and yet, after fifteen centuries of human enterprise, the highways and by-ways of England are filled with ignorance and stupidity, and with not a little superstition. The inhabitants seldom wander from their native valleys. "Lunnon" is as far distant to their apprehension as New York is to the settlers in Idaho. Almost within hearing of London bells, almost within sight of the towers of Oxford and Cambridge, at least four different dialects are spoken; there are millions of people who can neither read nor write; not a few districts where there is neither schoolhouse, nor church, nor doctor, nor lawyer; where the old Roman plow is still used, and the land is tilled in all respects in a very primitive way. What an Arcadian scene! These things are true especially of the dales of Yorkshire, Derbyshire, Buckinghamshire, and the wilder parts of Cornwall. Well fed and well housed the people may be, but for the most part they are as stupid as the cattle among whom they live. Their houses have stone floors, they live on coarse fare, and eat from pewter dishes; and, for sleeping, aspire only to the luxury of straw beds. They seldom see a newspaper, and if they do, only a few can read it. They have heard of the French and Buonaparte, and of America and her civil war, but of the great concerns of their

own nation and of the world at large, they know or care little. It is of country peasants like these that Wordsworth sings,—

This boy the fields produce,—his spade and hoe,
The carter's whip that on his shoulder rests,
In air high towering with a boorish pomp,
The sceptre of his sway: his country's name,
Her equal rights, her churches and her schools—
What have they done for him? And, let me ask,
For tens of thousands uninformed as he?

And if the farming population of these retired districts are often so ignorant, the manufacturing operatives of others are both ignorant and immoral. William Howitt gives many illustrations of the stupidity of the poor. In one district the people will tell you that the number of blossoms on the stem of the white lily indicates the price of wheat by the bushel for the ensuing year: each blossom being equivalent to a shilling. He says that in one of these vales lived the true original peasant who, not knowing how to frame his petitions to heaven, but who knew the letters of the alphabet, was heard repeating them over and over again in his devotions, and then desired his Maker to put them in such form as would best suit his necessities, and regard that as his prayer. He cites also the case of a small Cumberland farmer whose wife had not even heard of such a person as Jesus Christ. A visitor began to tell her of His divine advent to save the world, His life of benevolence, and His death upon the cross. "Having listened to all this very attentively, she inquired where this occurred, and that being answered, she asked, 'and when was it?' This being also told her, she very gravely observed, 'Well, it's sae far off, and sae lang since; we'll fain believe it na true!'"* These and the like are extreme cases, of course, but the wide-spread ignorance of the very poor in England is such as should abate somewhat the national pride in their peasantry.†

As to the manners, strictly so called, of the rural population,

* L, 161.

† This ignorance is not confined to the poor. A wealthy but unlettered farmer, at a recent town-meeting in England, moved with great dignity, "That this meeting be now adjourned" (*ipse dixit*). The motion was unanimously carried!

mention must be made of that gruffness and downright positiveness which are known everywhere as the prominent and fixed traits of John Bull. This is only one of the outcroppings of the pluck in which the English so pride themselves. They are men of wind and bottom; they are not afraid to say no; they never give up the ship. But this aside, it may be said of the higher classes, at least, that their manners are marked by a refined simplicity; though this is not without its exceptions. Born to rank and wealth, they have never felt the elation of sudden prosperity, and do not bring the deportment learned in a low condition into a higher and more cultivated one. They have no need to make a show of opulence and great state, or to put on airs of arrogance or silken softness, in order to impress mankind with a due sense of their exalted position; and they see enough of foolish extravagance to disgust them with mere outside splendor. For his daily dress, the noble lord is content with his cap and suit of gray, while the upstart millionaire must always be robed in splendid broadcloth. The noble lord is content to *walk* about the country, and to mingle freely with the common people, while the newly-rich man flashes by in a coach and four, and would fain keep aloof from the vulgar herd. It is perhaps easy to see why the man of high rank can consent to stoop to the poor and humble, rather than mingle with the aspiring middleclasses; also, why the successful tradesman carries himself loftily before the common folk; yet it is undeniably true that the social bearing of the gentry is simple, courteous, and unassuming. Foppishness and affected mannerism they despise. They betray little nervous apprehension lest their position should not be recognized. They have a certain easy dignity and refined naturalness which seem to be the fruit only of good breeding and long continued culture.

It is by no means true of all in the middle classes that they are coarse in manners, and given to display, and that they aspire to the social honors of the ranks above them. As in this country, so in that, there are multitudes who are content with the lot in which Providence has placed them, and who adorn that lot with every grace and virtue. The advantages of education are within their reach, and they do not need the artificial

aids of rank and power to perfect their social culture. Were we to travel leisurely up and down England, and visit the homesteads of well-to-do people, we should doubtless find everywhere many specimens of true, native born gentility, men and women of real refinement, and fitted to adorn any station in life. Burns' lines about "rank" and the "guinea-stamp" would be nowhere more true than in the land where rank and blood are so much thought of.

Yet again, here as everywhere the lust for wealth and show and social preferment lives and flourishes. Amid these tasteful cottages and villas everywhere dotting the landscape, where it would seem that peace and comfort must find their home, into these very paradises of beauty creeps the serpent of envy and discontent. For those who occupy a low or intermediate rank, there is some fancied good in a higher position. Jealousy exists between those on the same level, and contempt of those below. Not alone in democratic America does a poor ambition show itself in dashing equipage, pedantry of dress, costly dinner service, and sumptuous extravagance of entertainments. Here, in merrie England, beneath a fair outside of good manners, there is any reasonable amount of rivalry, heart-burning, personal pride, and mortification. The large farmer looks down upon the small; the professions upon the trades, and the trades upon one another. The man who keeps a carriage looks down upon him who keeps none or only drives a gig. Howitt tells a good story of a gentleman of large fortune, who, for some years after his residence in a particular neighborhood, did not set up a close carriage, but afterward finding it more agreeable to do so, was astonished to find himself called upon by a host of carriage-keeping people, who did not seem previously aware of his existence; and, rightly deeming the calls to be made upon his carriage rather than himself, sent round his empty carriage to deliver cards in return!

Among the poorer classes, while there is often much coarseness and vulgarity, coupled at times with servility of bearing and speech, there is not wanting much simplicity and frankness and true courteousness. This comes in part from their habitual intercourse with people of refinement, and from those les-

sons of deferential respect for the gentry and nobility which they learn with their alphabet and catechism.

As to the customs of the people, reference may be had to their fondness for rustic sports, such as hunting, fishing, racing, boating, cricket, and horsemanship. The Englishman's constitution seems to possess a surplus of energy which must find vent in all sorts of games and bodily exercises. He delights in simple motion. Highly as he rates talent and learning and domestic habits, he thinks hardly less of physical strength, agility, endurance. He has reduced field-sports to a science. Each has its own season, and is governed by its own well defined laws. For example: hunting, coursing, and shooting are the favorite sports of winter and early spring. At the opening of the warm season, the gun must be laid down, but the fishing-rod may be taken up,—a rod which, since Izaak Walton handled it, has been wreathed with the charms of literature and poetry. By the middle of August, grouse-shooting begins; partridge-hunting comes in September; coursing for hares in October, and for fox and deer, in November and the winter months. Other games are scattered through the year. The result of it all is that, while the English are a busy, hard-working people, they have yet such a fondness for amusement, that they find much time to enjoy it.

It should be noted, too, that they enliven the year with the observance of many special holidays, such as Christmas, New Year's, Easter, Whitsuntide, the Assizes, Fairs, and Wakes. During the last week in December, the scarlet-berried Holly, the Ivy, and Mistletoe are called upon to decorate the walls of rich and poor; the Yule-log is rolled on to the hearth; the table is loaded with good fare; and music, dancing, and merry-makings of all sorts, welcome in the Christmas carnival. It is a time of family reunions and general hilarity. With old Wither, some two hundred years ago, the old and young sing:

So now is come our joyful'st feast;
Let every man be jolly;
Each room with ivy leaves is dressed,
And every post with holly.

Now all our neighbors' chimneys smoke,
And Christmas blocks are burning,
Their ovens they with baked meats choke,
And all their spits are turning.

Without the door let sorrow lie ;
And if from cold it hap to die,
We'll bury it in a Christmas pie,
And ever more be merry, &c., &c.

New Year's day is less observed, and is merely a season for friendly salutations. Easter, the great festival of the established church, is made a day of joyful religious observance. Whitsuntide brings again relaxation from labor, and opportunities for social greetings and good fellowship. The Wake is a rural festival commemorating the dedication of a parish church. On the morning of the day, the bell rings out a merry peal, calling the people not to sermons and prayers, but to a feast of roast beef and plum-pudding, ending often with a procession and a dance. The Statutes are meetings held annually in central and convenient places for hiring farm-laborers and house-servants. To the laborers themselves these are favorite holidays. Here they meet old friends, and form new acquaintances. To indicate their respective callings, the man who would serve as a shepherd often sports a lock of wool under his hat-band; the teamster a piece of whip-lash; the milk-maid binds a tuft of cow's hair upon her bonnet; and ordinary farm laborers are known by their carters' frocks and hob-nail ankle-boots. The Fairs differ from like-named gatherings with us, in being places for the sale, rather than the show, of all sorts of products. Here, too, as with us, come mountebanks, jugglers, monstrosities of men and animals. It is a time for seeing and being seen; for losing hearts and purses.

Besides customs like these, there are others which once held sway in England, but have now disappeared, or are rapidly passing away. Even Christmas is shorn of half its ancient honors. Time was, when on this day the lord of the manor threw open his gates, inviting tenants and dependents to sit at his table, and to share with his high-born family in the festivities of the season. Rank and station were for the time forgotten.

Ale of twelve months old went circling round; the boar's head was served up in great state; burlesque pageants were performed; Christmas tales were repeated, and laughed at again and again; and oft-sung Christmas carols were sung over and over, and were thought all the better for being old. But these things have nearly gone by. So with May Day. Being a form of the old Roman festival of Flora, and so having the savor and unction of antiquity; embalmed in the verses of England's best poets; occurring at the delightful season of Spring; and always a favorite holiday with the young, it might seem that it would maintain an abiding hold upon the popular heart. In a few secluded districts of Derbyshire, May-poles may still be seen, and garlands are hung upon them every Spring. But this festival, too, is very much a thing of the past. The death-blow to it and the immoralities generally associated with it, was struck by the Reformation. Nor was its demolition a question altogether of morality and religion: it came through the natural growth of society. May Day and the rude revelings connected with it were the pastimes of an unthinking if not a corrupt age; the views and tastes of men underwent a great change in the progress of centuries: now wine must not be put into old bottles.

Several ancient games have now only a lingering hold upon the people;—such as archery, hawking, cock-fighting, boar-hunting, stag-hunting, tennis-court, the tilt, and tournament. Some of these are occasionally reproduced as matters of curiosity and amusement, but do not maintain an abiding place among the national customs. Over these changes, romantic and antiquarian people may lament, telling us that the golden age is past, that merrie England is merrie no more; but their mourning is vain. The times change, and men change with them. And instead of lamenting for what is irrecoverable it were better to devise new modes of public diversion and entertainment adapted to the spirit of the age. Many, indeed, have already been provided,—such as boating, skating, horseback-riding; public gardens and parks, museums and galleries of art, public lectures, reading-rooms, and musical concerts. These are recrea-

tions mostly of a higher order than the old, and are doubtless productive of as much enjoyment, if not of as much noise.

But our remarks have reached their assigned limits. We can conceive of but few pleasanter tours than one leisurely made up and down the rural portions of England, visiting scenes of historic and romantic interest, and studying the manners and habits of the people. But while waiting the opportunity of such a journey, one may be quite content with fireside travel over the same ground in the genial company of Howitt and Hawthorne.

ARTICLE II.—DR. DRAPER'S NEW BOOK.

Thoughts on the Future Civil Policy of America. By JOHN WILLIAM DRAPER, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry and Physiology in the University of New York; Author of a "Treatise on Human Physiology," and of a "History of the Intellectual Development of Europe." New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, Franklin Square. 1865.

If the only object we had in view, were to call attention to the mechanical execution of this book, there would be no occasion to use other than words of warm commendation. It is a beautiful specimen of American typography. Seldom does one meet with a volume which, in type, paper, binding, and general attractiveness, more completely fills out his idea of what a book ought to be. And this work comes from the press of Harper & Brothers. We have a painful recollection, reaching back over many years, of books issuing from their hands, which have been wanting in the elements of beauty, and still more deficient in strength and durability. The present specimen, however, is, in all respects, as nearly perfect as may well be.

Turning from the publishers to the writer, if we were to have regard only to the æsthetics of his work, grace and fluency of manner, wealth of illustration, wide sweep of general knowledge, and all those incidental touches of style by which an author puts himself into easy and agreeable relations with his readers, we should find slight occasion for blame. It is not to be denied, that, in these general particulars, the book bears a charm. It fascinates the reader, and he floats on as one borne upon a full-flowing stream, even though he find himself, little by little, in vital antagonism with the current that carries him forward. The book bears a striking likeness to the famous volumes of Mr. Buckle, in more points than one. These resemblances will appear as we go on, and we do not

wish to anticipate, except to say, that in attractiveness of style the two are wonderfully alike.

"There is no literary crime," says Dr. Draper, "greater than that of exciting a social and especially a theological odium against ideas that are purely scientific, none against which the disapproval of every educated man ought to be more strongly expressed. The republic of letters owes it to its own dignity to tolerate no longer offenses of that kind."* On the other hand, we sit down to write this Article, under the fixed impression that the republic of letters, in our own day and generation, has no more important service to perform, than to watch and discriminate carefully between what is scientific and what is not—to point out the fact, that much which obtrudes itself upon the world under this august name is nothing else than a system of showy and shallow hypothesis, even if it be anything more than the most vulgar private prejudice. Science, that is such in truth, is always and everywhere to be respected; and whatever crude conceptions on this subject may have belonged to other days, whatever unseemly conflicts may have arisen in the past, we are not aware that among the educated men of this age, theologians or others, true science is regarded with any other feeling than that of profound reverence. Scholars bow before it as that final truth which is not to be shaken. And just in proportion to their regard for what is truly scientific, is their contempt for the pretensions of science. When a man comes before his fellow-men with a set of half formed and rapid generalizations, when it is apparent at the merest glance that he is using the name of science simply to dogmatize and domineer, the "republic of letters" has other duties than to say "amen." We have no doubt that Professor Draper is truly a scientific man. He could unfold the laws and combinations of chemistry, or the facts of physiology, in so clear and masterly a way that all would feel and confess that he was dealing with those fixed and absolute truths which could not be gainsayed or resisted. But when leaving these fields of study, he chooses

* p. 236.

to ramble over those broader fields of thought, in which thousands of men are more at home than himself; when upon topics moral, philosophical, and theological, he comes forward and says, "I, also, will show mine opinion," he is at perfect liberty to do so; but because he sometimes stands behind a Professor's table, let him not therefore insinuate that his crude utterances on these subjects are *scientific*. They are the utterances, doubtless, of a thoughtful and cultivated man, with a strong bias in one particular direction, but they cannot have, at least in these pages, any of the privileges and immunities which belong always and everywhere to genuine science.

On the contrary, we have to say, that hardly anything is working more mischief, and producing more confusion in the great world of thought and opinion, than these oracular givings forth of some of our scientific men on topics wholly aside from their special studies. A multitude of people who read little, and think less, are deluded with the notion that such men must know whereof they affirm—while the trained thinker sees at a glance that these utterances are in defiance of all the laws on which true science proceeds; that the process of generalization is so rapid and superficial as to merit little respect. We fully agree with what Henry Rogers has said on this topic in a recent Article. He is addressing a certain "M. D.," real or imaginary. He says:

"You ascribe my skepticism in relation to your new-fangled speculations, to a 'blind adherence' to the traditional beliefs of a 'stereotyped theology,' and you tell me that it is in oblivion or contempt of what Bacon says in the First Book of his 'Novum Organum.' You were never more mistaken in your life. I demur to your scientific crotchets, not because I believe the Bible, (though I do believe it), but because I believe in Bacon. If I know myself, I fancy that, even though I had not read a syllable of the Bible, and had no 'traditional beliefs' to renounce, I should have objected to the new scientific dogmas which you urge on my acceptance, just as much as I do now; and that precisely because (as I think) you, and not I, have forgotten Bacon, and been misled by those 'idols' of the human intellect, before which not theologians alone, but scientific speculators, too, (as, indeed, his First Book is more expressly designed to show), may too readily fall. * * * * Certainly, my friend, I believe that never, since Bacon's time, has there been greater license of hypothesis than in our own day; and that, especially, in relation to subjects demanding (if they are ever destined to be effectually settled by man at all, and are not rather among those things

which it is the 'glory of God to conceal,' or which he leaves to our modest conjecture only) the utmost exercise of philosophic caution and self-restraint."

L. Our first objection to Dr. Draper's book has reference to *the place which it makes man occupy in the scheme of creation*. He is imbedded in mere matter, emerging by slow degrees out of the earth, not even struggling as in the old mythologies to get free, but quietly waiting to be pushed up by the material forces beneath. The idea of a physical universe, made and prepared originally, expressly to be the abode of free, immortal spirits, made for no other end than to fill a subordinate place, and to serve in the training and discipline of these spirits; all this is as utterly foreign to the main idea of this book, as it was to Mr. Buckle's philosophy. As we read on, page after page, the *great* thing seems to be a world of matter, organic and inorganic, and man an incidental off-shoot. That lofty conception of man, which meets us in the Bible, as when David breaks out, "For thou hast made him a little lower than the angels, and hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands:" this is entirely reversed in the philosophical system before us, and man is either a part and portion of a merely material universe, or is so bound hand and foot by the network of physical laws, that he has no freedom and independent power whatever. He has no real lordship over nature, but, on the contrary, nature has a most absolute lordship over him.

In order that we may put our readers in possession of Dr. Draper's ideas on this point, in the language which he himself has chosen, and not in our own, we will group together a few passages, taken mostly from the first chapter of the book. We shall italicize where we wish to call special attention to the language used. "A rain-drop descends from the clouds: that simple phenomenon, like a thousand others we might consider, teaches us that there are two existences *with which all exact science* has to deal. They are *Matter and Force*." p. 17. Not *Matter and Mind*, be it observed, which is the usual form of opening the subject, whenever a general survey of science is made, but *matter and force*. That drop of water in the particles which compose it, and the action of gravitation which brings

it to the ground, present in miniature everything to which exact science has reference. How far the author, if pressed, would take shelter under the word "exact," we cannot say, but subsequent quotations will throw light on the meaning which he probably attaches to the whole sentence. "Since Force cannot be created from nothing, and is in its very nature indestructible, it (science) must determine from what source that which is displayed by animals has been obtained, in what manner it is employed, and what disposal is made of it eventually. The Force comes from the Sun, the Matter from the Air." p. 20. "Without the Gulf Stream, Newton would never have written his Principia, nor Milton his Paradise Lost." p. 25. "If we consider the successive races of organized beings, beginning from the lowest and passing to the higher tribes, *it would seem* as if the general idea, under which Nature is acting, is, as the more complex structures are evolved, to emancipate them from the direct control of external physical forces. * * The Lion can retire to a shade in the middle of the day; yet still he is held in a state of subjection, and instinctively submits to the operation of an overruling power, and is kept to the sands of his desert from cool and temperate climates. The sunbeam is his chain. In man alone the emancipation is complete, for nature has committed a control of her forces to him. It matters not whether he be in the torrid zone or frigid, he can temper the seasons by resorting to artifices of clothing or by the management of fire. * * *But though thus seemingly the master*, man is really the dependent of physical agencies. The development of his intellect, which gives him a control over them, *is in truth determined by them.*" pp. 28 and 29. "He who is immersed in the turmoil of a crowded city sees nothing but the acts of men; and, if he formed his opinion from his experience alone, must consider that the course of events altogether depends on the uncertainties of human volition. But he who ascends to a sufficient elevation loses sight of the passing conflicts, and no longer hears the contentions. He discovers that the importance of individual action is diminishing as the panorama beneath him is extending. And if he would attain to the truly philosophical, the general point of view, disengaging himself from all terres-

trial influences and entanglements, rising high enough to see the whole globe at a glance, his acutest vision would fail to discern the slightest indication of man, *his free will* or his works." pp. 34, 35. "There is a course through which we *must* go. [The italic word here is Dr. Draper's]. Let us cast from ourselves the untrue, the unworthy belief that the will of man determines the events of the world." p. 240. "Man presents the utmost perfection thus far attained. His brain has reached a maximum organization by a continued and unbroken process of development." p. 246. "From a purely mechanical state, appropriately termed automatism, a higher state, the Instinctive, is educed; from that in its turn, still a higher, the Intelligent." p. 244.

If the Professor, searching through the long ages of the past, would actually show us a single instance, in which Nature is caught in the very act of transforming a creature out of the automatic state, into the instinctive, or out of the instinctive into the intelligent—if he knows of a single well attested fact, showing any such transition, then we would concede that his argument was proceeding upon the Baconian foundation, and that his conclusion might have some claim to be called Scientific. But so long as he and other men choose to talk of the development theory, as though it were a settled thing, when it comes not by an observation of the facts of nature, but as a simple figment of their own brains, in the service of materialism, they must consent to be ranked where they belong—not on the sacred roll of science, so far forth at least as this theory is concerned, but as men who substitute dogmatism for thinking, and superficial hypothesis for the careful deductions of the scientific method. There is a science of Mind as well as of Matter. Human consciousness gives the fact of freedom of the will, as certainly as the laboratory shows the elements which enter into the composition of air or water. No Professor of physical science can any more upset that fact, than a metaphysician can alter the fixed relations of oxygen and nitrogen in forming the atmosphere we breathe. Whoever attempts, as our author has done, to override the freedom of the human will, cannot go far in his philosophy before he will show that he him-

self believes in freedom as other men do. Prof. Draper has abundantly shown that he believes it, as we shall have occasion by and by to point out. It is a *real* freedom too, not an imaginary one, such as is occasionally hinted at in the quotations given. The Science that gives us this fact of freedom is real Science, built upon a solid and philosophical basis, and not at all like that shadowy speculation which goes without the aid of facts, and runs itself out into idle theories and developments.

But surely we have brought forward passages enough to show that we did not misrepresent the book, in saying that man appears deeply imbedded in matter, waiting helplessly to be pushed up, by the material forces beneath. He is anything but a lord of this lower world, as he is here presented to us.

It is often made a matter of complaint, by certain classes of men, when the doctrines of the Word of God are faithfully preached, that Man is dishonored—that by charging him so freely with sin and guilt—by holding him up as a sinner, needing pardon of God through Christ, needing a renovated nature that he may be fitted for happiness and heaven; we strip him of his inborn glory—we humiliate him in his own sight and in the sight of others—we cast him down from his high estate. Does it not occur to these men to enquire whether man is dishonored by such doctrines as the book before us contains? Do they ever attempt to follow such doctrines out to their conclusions, and conjecture what would be the condition of human society if ideas like these should become universally prevalent? On the other hand, we contend, that the Bible, by its influence direct and indirect, and especially by the stern and humbling doctrines of the cross, is the one great power at work on earth, which tends in any good degree to preserve the dignity of the individual man, and to throw around every soul, even the humblest, an everlasting consequence and worth. Wherever man has lived and developed his ideas and his institutions in what may be called a natural way, without this light and influence of revelation, there the dignity of man as man—the rights of the individual—the grandeur of the soul—have always been lost sight of. Woman becomes a slave or a drudge, of hardly more consequence than the brute, and among men,

the many exist for the few. This experiment has been tried so long, and in every variety of way, that Prof. Draper ought not to expect that the Christian world, at least, should be willing to try it over again, especially with the addition of such theories as he has to propose about man's nature and origin. If the whole race should be put upon such a trial, with all conflicting and restraining influences removed, it would descend into the quagmires of corruption and moral death with amazing rapidity. And yet we are compelled to hear, in various directions, these whisperings of men calling themselves scientific, who are greatly shocked and disgusted at the way man is treated from the pulpit, where an evangelical gospel is preached; but who seem to take a strange delight in holding him up as a mere development from the mud of the earth, or as having been pushed up to his present state, out of some order of the animal creation.

If they can find on some island of the sea, or in any remote corner a fragment of the race thrown off in the convulsions of history, which has sunk step by step, through sin and vice, so that it is pointed at as a disgrace to humanity, these vile and fallen specimens are paraded before us, as showing what man is in some stages of the ascending scale, and through what track we ourselves have probably come. Not to such sources of information do we turn, when we would keep alive in our souls an exalted idea of what man is.

We open the Bible, and at once man rises before us in his god-like dignity. He is no longer an accidental formation out of dead matter, or a slow result of mere physical agencies. He does not come before us, mixed up promiscuously with the mere animal world. He stands apart in his majesty—vast and immortal interests clustering around him—great in his origin and great in his destiny. We hear God saying, "Let us make man in our own image. * * * So God created man in his own image, * * * and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Here is a being not coming up by slow and painful stages according to some law of development, but fashioned into perfect form and issuing from the hand of his Creator—born for thought and contemplation—

born for freedom—born for dominion. How beautifully and naturally does this ancient narrative carry out the idea of his inherent dignity—of his lordship over nature and over the animal world. “And out of the ground, the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them to Adam, *to see what he would call them*, and whatsoever Adam called every living thing, that was the name thereof. And Adam gave names to all cattle, and to the fowl of the air, and to the beasts of the field.” This is the biblical story of man’s origin. But to those naturalists, who are delving forever amid forms of matter—dead and living organisms—until they utterly forget the soul, as a real and independent existence, the Bible is a book of old superstition—crude and antiquated notions—presenting a very low idea of man. They come in with their splendid systems of philosophy to help elevate him, by showing that he is not in any sense an original creation, but only the highest animal, that he is fast bound in the fetters of matter—that if he thinks he has liberty it is a delusion, for in fact he is entirely under the control of physical influences and forces. This is the glory in which modern science, in some of its more advanced and illuminated forms, gives to man. For ourselves we prefer the ancient superstition. We are not at all pleased with the companionship into which we are brought by these great lights and benefactors of mankind.

Moreover, when man had fallen into sin, the Bible looks upon him as worth saving, and that, too, at a great cost. His god-like origin and nature are not lost sight of, under these sad conditions. There is greatness in these ruins. Just as we muse over the wreck of some ancient temple or palace, with its broken arches and fallen columns, till before our mind’s eye, the structure rises again in all its old magnificence, so God sees the greatness of his creature man, under this wreck and ruin of sin, and with a great ransom he opens the way for his deliverance. It is through the power and presence of such ideas, borne in upon us from above, that man is raised little by little in the scale of being. Prof. Draper has drawn his illustrations from wide fields of history. We commend to him the whole field of history, since the world began, as bearing evidence of the truth of what we say.

Whenever, therefore, in any part of the world, we find some portion of the human family, unusually low and degraded, the Bible view of the case is, not that they were originally so created, or that they are slowly crawling up from even a lower depth of being, but that they have fallen step by step from a high and honorable ancestry—that they have sunk to this condition under the power of sin and moral corruption. And seeing them thus, it does not sneer and scoff as human pride does—it does not insinuate that they cannot be helped, because the climate is not propitious—but it looks upon them only to pity and compassionate. It sets earnestly to work to lift them up again to the high state from whence they have fallen. In all the philosophy of this divine book, man is everywhere honored—honored most of all in those doctrines of the cross, which are such an offense to the wisdom of this world.

Now we claim that no system of so-called science can be true, which sets man in a position entirely different from this. This we claim, not *because* the Bible presents him in this attitude, but because on a wide and comprehensive view of things, the facts of the case are in this way satisfactorily harmonized. The Bible makes known to us many truths, which we should never have discovered ourselves, but so soon as they reach us in this way, we see their truth, by the harmony which exists between them and all other truth. To the ancients there were many gods, and what is to us the *universe* was to them a confused medley of warring sections and provinces. So it would have been with us, without this light from above. But the moment we gain a conception of one vast and all comprehending system, turning in harmony, and ruled by One Mind, what was before incomprehensible becomes plain, and we take the truth, almost forgetting how it came to us, and carry it into all the economy of our thought. It becomes like a sun shining perpetually upon us. So this bible truth respecting man was unknown, at least in its fullness, to the ancients, and would have been unknown to us, if we had not reached it by revelation. But having come into our possession, we carry it with us continually and it harmonizes what would else be dark and mysterious. The Bible every-

where recognizes man as a being with a Will of his own, having power to choose good or evil. He knows for himself that he has such a Will, and Dr. Draper might beat against this fact with his philosophy till doomsday, and it would have not the slightest effect in unsettling it, though it might work untold mischief in leading men to do as he has done, theoretically deny it. Man has no business to have a conscience, according to the theory of this book. There is no place for it in this economy, and Dr. Draper tries indeed to leave it out as a matter of no consequence. But Man has a Conscience. The whole earth bears witness to the fact. Every system of religion, false and true, from the beginning until now, attests its presence. Go where we will,—search amid whatever ruins of the past, and continually we are met by the proofs that man has ever felt himself guilty, and has desired in some way to shield himself from apprehended evil. But conscience is utterly out of joint with any system of mere physical necessity.

So, too, Prof. Draper seems to have no power to see man, except in entire subordination to the material world, which underlies and surrounds him. We, looking with other eyes, are most of all impressed with his dominion over nature. We confess to his subjection in many most important respects, but the fact of his lordship over this lower world is as manifest certainly as his bondage, and is indeed one of the most striking facts connected with his history. The philosophy of this book exactly fits the case of the lower animals, but is most strangely at variance with the facts pertaining to man. The brute creation, without free-will are helplessly bound in the chains of mere natural law, and can never of themselves break away from this entanglement, consequently we see them from generation to generation, if left to themselves, running the same continuous round, without progress. But is this the case with man? Does he inhabit the earth after this fashion—he who has changed all the face of nature,—turning the wilderness into a fruitful field,—building structures, in whose presence he seems but a pigmy,—rearing cities,—traversing stormy oceans in his frail bark,—binding the strong powers of nature to work his will,—weighing the stars in the balance of his

thought,—sending out lightning as his messenger,—wandering from land to land in endless migrations,—overturning empires with the armies which he marshals and leads,—is this the being that *must* go in a certain course and no other,—that is bound so fast in the chains of physics that he cannot stir hand or foot out of a prescribed track? We do not so read the record. Man's course on the earth has been exactly in accordance with the biblical view of his relations to nature, but not in accordance with Dr. Draper's and Mr. Buckle's philosophy. "Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thine hand," and this dominion, notwithstanding it has been grievously impaired by sin, nevertheless he has had, and the whole earth testifies to the fact.

Nature has indeed had a powerful dominion also over him, but not wholly an enforced dominion. His subjection has come largely through his free-will, and by his habits of ease and self-indulgence. Duty has called him to resistance in a thousand ways, in which he knew and felt that he had the power to resist, but did not. He has yielded to his sensual appetites and passions, when conscience was crying out against the indulgence. It is true, that in some respects the dominion of the material world over us is absolute and unconditional. We cannot fight successfully against the attraction of gravitation. We cannot stop our growth from infancy to age. We must undergo the changes of mind and body incident to the passage from childhood to youth, and from youth to manhood. But the field of our liberty is much larger than the place of our confinement. Though we cannot help growing old, it lies within our own power whether our old age shall be one of disgrace or honor. We can determine whether our bodies shall bear the marks of vice, or the impress of virtue and sobriety. Man cannot stop the changes of the year, or reverse the order of the seasons. Summers and winters will go and come according to their law. But whether summer shall produce for him its fruits, and fill his garners with grain, or whether he shall "beg in harvest and have nothing," is made as a general rule dependent upon his own free-will, and his self-imposed activity. And under the same sky, with the same earth beneath, the

same mountains and rivers around, one man, moving in his freedom, takes one course, and another a wholly different course. We might go on and illustrate this principle to any extent, but it is needless. That the dominion of nature over man, in some respects, is fixed and absolute, all will concede. But that man in his turn has the widest dominion over nature, would seem too obvious to require argument.

We charge it then upon the volume before us, that it degrades and brutalizes man,—it despoils him of the honor and glory that rightfully belong to him. And if the doctrines in this book were to prevail generally, they would tend most powerfully to destroy all high and lofty intellectual and moral aspiration.

II. Our next objection to the book is, that it is strangely at war with itself.

When an author has laid it down as a premise in his system, that man has no freedom whatever,—that he is totally under the dominion of physical law,—that even what we call his intellect, though seemingly above nature, is nevertheless in complete bondage to it,—when he sets this forth as a first truth, or axiom, *his* work evidently is done. He has nothing more to do or say. If man is a being of this sort, held fast in the fetters of mere materialism, and without any power, in and of himself to determine his course or destiny, then if anything is clear, it is clear that he is to be left there in silence, for nature to manipulate and operate on, as she may, and to make what out of him she can. It is not for Prof. Draper to approach this being, who is stuck fast in the mud, with any suggestions as to how he can make his condition more comfortable and easy. The man's condition is not to be changed any how, by anything which he, himself, can do, for he has no will. The forces that act on him are underneath him, and entirely out of human reach. It is a great piece of impertinence to hover round one in this plight, and to bid him be careful and avoid the superstitious teachings of the clergy, and to remember always that science is the great power that elevates man and society. What business has this "friend, philosopher, and guide," here any way, addressing arguments which can only

take effect through the reason and will, when the poor fellow has no will at all?

We are heartily tired of this modern wisdom which cannot stir a foot without devouring itself. Sometimes it comes in the shape of a theologian who defines *sin* to be a perfectly innocent and harmless thing—a mere friction of finite nature having no evil consequences attached to it whatever,—but on the other hand possessed of an educating power, by which man is steadily lifted toward perfection; and then he turns and blasts men on the right hand and on the left for their wickedness. His public vocation is to show that men generally are corrupt, cruel, grasping, bigoted, oppressive, and in every way wrong, except those who go to his meeting. Or sometimes the theology takes a somewhat different form, and teaches that to try and awaken in men a *sense* of sin,—to make them go with bowed heads under a feeling of guilt, is the greatest wrong which can possibly be committed, and that the man who does such a thing ought to feel what a miserable wretch he is, and to know that no punishment can be too great for him.

Or again, this wisdom presents itself in the form of a refined and gentle optimism, which bathes itself in moonlight, and goes out in dreams and ecstatic visions, but if it ever condescends to come down and discourse about the actualities of this work-a-day world, it finds society at sixes and sevens, at all points, and everything, somehow, needs to be made over. Or sometimes, as in the book before us, it takes the scientific turn, teaching us that individuals and nations have their destinies determined for them, without any power on their own part to make them otherwise than they are, and then goes off into a consideration of what men should do, and what they should not do, in the regulation of their life and conduct, or, passing on to the broad field of national interests, attempts to shape out a “future civil policy of America,” when that policy is determined absolutely from all eternity by the climate, soil, rivers, mountains, and lakes, and other physical influences, underlying and surrounding the nation.

It is related of the witty divine, Rev. Thomas Williams, that having written the sermon to be preached at the funeral of

the celebrated Dr. Emmons, years before the death of the latter, he was one day reading the sermon to the Doctor himself, who had a natural curiosity to hear what was said in it, when he was interrupted by a remark from the listener, "Stop!" said Mr. Williams, "you have nothing to say; you are a dead man." We say the same thing of Dr. Draper, in reference to all the suggestions which he has kindly consented to make to us in the latter part of his book. He has no business to be talking. He has cut himself off from the right of addressing arguments to men, of such a nature that they can take effect only on their reason, and be acted out through their freedom of will, when they have no such freedom.

That we may not seem to be writing at random, we return again and quote the language of our author. He is speaking of the close analogy which exists between the life of an Individual and the life of a Nation, and says—"Nor does the analogy between the Individual and the Nation end here. A similar, perhaps a more surprising parallelism is perceived when their modes of growth are considered, for not alone in the incidents of birth and death are they alike. As the former pursues his way through the successive stages of infancy, childhood, youth, maturity, old age, so, as history teaches, does the latter too. The Individual, *helplessly and in a predestined manner*, runs through these stages, being unable to modify their succession, or to accelerate or retard their occurrence. The Nation, also, in a like helpless and predetermined way, moves through the same inevitable career. *An unavoidable destiny rules over the progress of both.*" p. 16. If this language, so far as the Individual is concerned, is made to refer simply and solely to these successive stages of life, then of course we admit its truth. We select the sentence more especially for what is said about the law which rules over the life of a Nation. But we quote again,—“And here I cannot help making the remark, that whoever accepts these principles as true, and bears in mind *how physical circumstances control the deeds of men, as it may be said in spite of themselves*, will have a disposition to look with generosity on the acts of political enemies.” p. 80.

We do not deny that Dr. Draper claims that he finds a place

in his system for the freedom of the will, but what this freedom amounts to, we will let him explain for himself. "I have descended to these paltry facts, and quoted these seemingly trivial numbers, for the purpose of bringing into clearer relief the *cardinal doctrine* that in individual life, in social life, in national life, everything is influenced by physical agents, and is, therefore, under the control of law. Far from denying the operation of man's free will, I give to that great truth all the weight that can be desired; but then I affirm *there is something that overrides*, that forever keeps it in check.

"If the reader will try a very simple physiological experiment upon himself, he will, probably, come to a clearer understanding of what is here meant. Let him execute with his right hand the motion he would resort to in winding a thread upon a reel. Then let him do the same thing, only winding the opposite way. * * * Next let him try to do both,—not successively, but simultaneously. Let him put forth all the strength of his determination. A free-will actor, he has now the opportunity of giving an illustration of his power. In the failure of repeated trials, he may discern what his voluntary determinations come to, and what they are really worth. He may learn from this simple experiment, that there is something over-controls him, and puts a limit to his power." pp. 36, 37.

To all this we have to say, that it no more disproves freedom of the will, than does the fact, that an infant in the cradle cannot use his fingers with the skill and dexterity of an adult. That which is here presented to be done can, doubtless, be accomplished with the utmost ease by one who has trained himself to it, and he would not, perhaps, find it difficult to vary the performance, by an equally complicated double-motion with his feet at the same time.

But we have brought forward passages enough to show that our author does not allow any *real freedom*, either for individuals or for nations. They alike go on in their predestined way, under the control of physical law. And, therefore, we say that his brilliant chapter, "On the political force of ideas," and all the suggestions which he makes in the closing part of the book,

with a view to shape the "future policy of America," this way or that, are utterly irrelevant. From his premises he has no business to bring them forward. But letting go this discrepancy, and supposing the whole matter to rest upon a common basis of argument, we have this further to say,—

III. That we object to this book for the estimate in which it holds moral and religious influences, as compared with scientific.

We may understand the author's position on this point by a few brief quotations. "There are but three powers that can organize the world,—theology, literature, science. Europe has tried the first; her present condition shows what is the utmost it can do. China has tried the second, and has become conceited and exclusive. It has been truly affirmed that for these purposes science has this advantage over literature, that it admits of universal communion." p. 250. "I repeat again the great truth, that the only method of ameliorating the condition of men is by acting on their intelligence; even their morals must be guided by their understanding." p. 270. "The moral is, in its very nature, stationary. Alone it is incompetent to guide the advancement of society. Social elevation can only be accomplished by appealing to the understanding, and that will influence the heart." p. 291. "The education of the clergy, I think, is not equal to that of physicians or lawyers. The provisions are sufficient, and the time is sufficient, but the direction is faulty." p. 277. "Content with such a knowledge of nature as might have answered a century ago, the imposing and ever-increasing body of modern science they decline. And yet it is that science and its practical applications which are now guiding the destinies of civilization." pp. 278, 279.

We shall not attempt to prove that clergymen are as well educated as doctors and lawyers, but we have reason to rejoice that their culture is broad and catholic enough, so that they can combine and hold in one enlarged view, theology, literature, and science, as efficient and harmonious instrumentalities for shaping and elevating mankind. We know of no one, at least among those clergymen who have received a liberal edu-

cation in this part of the land, who ever thinks of divorcing theology from literature and science, after this manner. And so far is it from true, that there is any hostility against real science on the part of the clergy, or any opposition to the widest and most thorough education of the whole people, this very idea of universal education among us came not originally from men of science, but from plain and sternly religious men. It never would have found its way into the world where such views of man's origin and destiny prevailed, as those developed in the volume before us. It is not the growth of any such philosophy. It may, with far more propriety, be regarded as a strictly religious idea. It came in with men of Puritan faith, who thought the soul of every individual, even the humblest, to be something of such infinite worth, that it must not be left in darkness and moral night. They looked upon men, not alone with reference to the place they might fill in an earthly state or kingdom (though they did not neglect this), but their thought was more intently fixed upon the place they might fill, and the part they might bear in the eternal kingdom of a personal and holy God. And with such views they had minds broad enough, and faith strong enough, to body forth and sustain such a scheme for the universal education of the people, as no materialistic philosophy ever yet conceived. So far from having any opposition to true and genuine science, the first measures for the promotion of science in this country were originated in colleges manned and controlled by clergymen, and existing primarily for the education of clergymen. Be it understood, once for all, that the educated ministers of this country, at least those of New England origin, are not afraid of *science*, but they repudiate such thinking and reasoning as abound in this book. They have, it is true, a profound conviction that there is an original and independent existence called Mind, as well as a world of Matter—that the former has a philosophy of its own, as well as the latter, not finished and complete any more than natural science is, but in many of its fundamental principles established beyond the liability of change. They see at a glance that our author is beating

wildly against these first truths of mental and moral philosophy, and that as God works the universe, so that there is a practical harmony between the various departments, so a science cannot be genuine and true which sets these departments in a position of utter antagonism.

But, above all things, let the Professor disabuse himself of the fond conceit that in his fine talk about universal education and the like, he is doing anything more than to echo the sentiment of the Puritan Church in this country for two hundred years. It may be that as Dr. Draper is not a native of this country, this may be his excuse for not knowing that, in generations gone by, he might have seen anywhere among the quiet hills and valleys of New England, the parish ministers, not simply talking in brilliant rhetoric, but quietly working out, by their daily labor and constant influence, this grand scheme for the universal education of the people. We can say to him as Paul said to some of his Gentile converts, who were growing a little vain and conceited of their new position and privileges, "if thou being a wild olive-tree wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive-tree; boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, *thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.*"

Under the head of "Moral," it must be kept in mind by the readers of this book, that the author includes what we call *religious*, and he throws all this out of the account as a fixed quantity which may be entirely disregarded in solving the great problem of man's elevation. This is such a complete reproduction of Mr. Buckle's argument, that we are somewhat surprised not to find it credited to its author. It is, moreover, such a unique and original invention, that we wonder how any one dare trespass on the rights of the first patentee, without making some mention of his indebtedness. We have no patience to attempt to refute such an argument, by any long train of reasoning. Its character may be estimated by the way it strikes the common sense of mankind. To give religion and morals so contemptible a place as this—to make them the humble servants, following behind to bear up the trailing skirts of science, who sweeps on in her magnificent array, is

something which few men have ever dared to do. To assert, in substance, that morality has just as much force and influence among the Fejee islanders, or savage Hottentots, as among the most Christian nations—that it is just as much of a reality in the dens of vice, as in the churches of the Living God, is simply to insult the human understanding.

In reading this book, we have been constantly reminded, by the association of violent contrast, of Dr. Bushnell's volume entitled "Nature and the Supernatural." It would be difficult to find two treatises on Nature and Man, where the stand-points of the writers are more immeasurably distant, the one from the other. Let us cull a few sentences to show how differently they discourse. Dr. Bushnell says, "We look upon them (men) not as wheels that are turned by natural causes, yielding their natural effects, as the flour is yielded by a mill, but what we call their character is the majestic proprium of their personality, that which they yield as the fruit of their glorious selfhood and immortal liberty. * * * * We meet the spontaneous verdict of mankind, apart from all theories, and quibbles, and sophistries of argument, testifying that man is a creature out of mere nature—a free cause in himself—great, therefore, in the majesty of great virtues and heroic acts." p. 58. Dr. Draper says, "In whatever direction we look, we may therefore expect to find proofs of the dominion of law (i. e. physical law). Even in those cases *where the voluntary agencies of man might seem to interfere*, vestiges of that dominion are obvious enough." p. 24. Dr. Bushnell says, "The same is true, as we may safely assume, in regard to all the other orders and realms of spiritual existence; to angels good and bad, seraphim, principalities, and powers in heavenly places. They are all supernatural, and it is in them, as belonging to this higher class of existences, that God beholds the final causes, the uses, and the grand systematizing ideas of his universal plan. Nature, as comprehending the domain of cause and effect, is only the platform on which he establishes his kingdom, *as a kingdom of minds or persons*, every one of whom has power to act upon it, and, to some extent, greater or less, to be sovereign over it." p. 58. Dr. Draper says, "At the

commencement of the vista of organization, the forms are obscure, in structure simple, in habit low. * * * * But, by a gradual unfolding of structure, part developing from part, and function emerging from function, a higher stage is reached—to automatism instinct is added. * * * * Still looking along the chain as we advance once more, we recognize a repetition of the same process, or, more correctly, the gradual addition of something higher. Instinct is unfolding itself into Intelligence. The animated being shows reasoning powers at every successive rising link, increasing in precision and perfection—the adaptation of purposed means to the accomplishment of wished-for-ends. The dog forms his plans; his master relates with admiration how he has watched him proceed in carrying them out, persuading himself that there is something approaching wisdom even in the brute. Here, again, as in the former case, the new faculty has not destroyed the old one, but intelligence is co-existing, both with instinct and automatism.” p. 243.

In short, all that man is, and all that he can ever hope to be, is seen as a slow emanation out of the earth itself. He is, in all his parts, but the offspring of materialism. Dr. Bushnell takes his stand by the throne of a free and personal God, and looks out over the whole material universe, and sees in it only a magnificent habitation prepared for the abode and culture of free beings, who stand above nature, and, to a large extent, dominate over it. Dr. Draper takes his stand amid the organic forces of the merely natural world, and calls upon us to behold all human intelligences, all earthly principalities and powers, slowly ascending from this material abyss, but forever in subjection to the power that raises them. We can say of this philosophy, as Dr. Bushnell says of another sort: “Such kind of influence would turn the race to pismires, if only we could stay content in it, as happily we cannot; for, if we chance to find our pleasure in it for an hour, a doom as strong as eternity in us compels us finally to spurn it as a brilliant inanity.”

ARTICLE III.—LORD DERBY AND PROFESSOR ARNOLD ON HOMER.

The Iliad of Homer rendered into English Blank Verse.
By EDWARD EARL OF DERBY. New York: C. Scribner &
Co. 1865.

Lectures "On Translating Homer," contained in "Essays in Criticism." By MATTHEW ARNOLD, Professor of Poetry in the University of Oxford. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1865.

"THE study of classical literature is probably on the decline," says Professor Arnold in his Lectures, and Lord Derby, in the preface to his translation of the Iliad, gives his regretful testimony to the same effect. These concurrent opinions, from two men with such ability and opportunity to judge the matter, with such a bias in the opposite direction, and speaking from such different points of view, almost compel our assent, reluctant as we may be to give it. If the fact is admitted, it would be an interesting question how much this effect is due in England to faulty theories of school education, how much to an unsatisfactory and unsound type of national scholarship, how much to the virtual limitation of University privileges to the highest class of society, and how much to what are called the practical tendencies of the age. A yet more profitable investigation for us would be into the prospects of classical studies in our own country. Thus far, indeed, they have hardly made progress enough to be capable of any decline, and so the question for us ought rather to be, will they remain always as they are, or may we look for a more general and more thorough cultivation of them as the wealth, leisure, and refinement of our people increase? We have not here the traditional practices and text-books of distant centuries to hamper our methods of education in schools and colleges, but neither have we the rich endowments, the noble

libraries, the curious manuscripts, which England has inherited from those same past centuries. Our classical scholarship here, what there is of it, has as yet no settled wrong direction, and tends to form itself on the German, rather than on the English model, but it has too much of the shallowness and haste of the American in it still, and hardly enough independence or perseverance to build up a character of its own. And while the freedom of an education, to every one who can earn or borrow the money to pay for it, widens the spread of its benefits, on the other hand, among us, it is easy to gain position by wealth without education; and the impossibility of retaining property in families leaves us without a recognized class of highly educated men. Surely, too, in this country, the "practical tendencies of the age" are no less strong, and no less violent in their attack upon classical education, than in England. In these respects the advantages and disadvantages of the two countries may seem about evenly balanced; but who can fail to see that classical studies cannot have in a new country, in a country, let us say, settled since the sixteenth century, that prescriptive right to form with mathematics the best instrument for mental training, which they have in the old countries; that there is, in fact, a strong and growing demand that education should be confined as much as possible to what will be of direct use in life; and that benevolence is active in encouraging the advance of the natural and practical sciences far more than that of classical studies? Who thinks of endowing a Latin or Greek professorship, or of establishing scholarships for proficient in those studies, at the present day? We do not complain of this tendency. If classical studies, fairly tried, prove themselves inferior to other means in education, let them be thrown over, or reduced to a subordinate position. But let the proposed substitute be thoroughly tried, before it dislodges that which has undergone for so many centuries, and with such results, the test of use.

We turn from these thoughts to our proper subject, which is Lord Derby's translation of the *Iliad*, viewed especially from the stand-point of Professor Matthew Arnold's lectures, "On Translating Homer." Of these two contributions to the work

of translating Homer into English, the lectures have decidedly the greater and more permanent value. They are liable to criticism, or even censure, for their frequent flippancy, and for their habit of supplying lack of argument sometimes by strength of assertion, sometimes by a pun or a fling at the blindness of any opponent. They take and defend certain positions, in which neither poets nor scholars will be likely to uphold them. But we prefer to speak here only of their value, which consists mainly in two points: they designate the tribunal, and declare the law, by and before which any translation of Homer must be tried. They designate the tribunal; it consists of "scholars, who possess, at the same time with knowledge of Greek, adequate poetical taste and feeling." To these men every translation should be submitted, to decide how nearly it produces upon them the same effect that the original does. This is the true test. This seems to be the fair question to ask about any translation. Not, has it poetical merit? Not, does it affect people generally as the original did in its time and place? Not, does it give us just the ideas of the original as faithfully as they can be expressed in English? But, does it affect the mind as Homer does? And this question can be justly answered only by those who can read Homer so as to receive a vivid impression from him, and, at the same time, can judge of the due effect of English poetry. Mr. Arnold also declares the law by which a translation of Homer should be tried, in these four points: 1. It must be rapid in its movement, as Homer is. 2. It must be simple and direct in expression, as he is. 3. It must be simple and direct in thought, as he is. 4. It must be noble, as he is; never low or quaint or familiar. These are excellent canons of criticism: it occurs to us, however, to remark, that they do not exhaust the subject, and that, of these four qualities, only the second and third seem entitled by their importance to be thus mentioned apart from others. Before he gets through, Mr. Arnold mentions two other characteristics of Homer which ought to be preserved in a translation, "a loose and idiomatic grammar," and an "idiomatic diction or language." Besides all these, we think there are others which no less demand to be reproduced

in an English version. There is, for instance, a healthy, joyous, out-of-door tone in both thought and language such as has immortalized itself in the unvarying smile on the faces of the *Ægina* marbles, and which Mr. Arnold himself happily appreciates in another paper where he speaks of the "cheerful, sensuous, pagan life;" there is "the grace of ease," (as Cowper happily phrases it, lamenting the lack of it in his own translation), which is something quite different from the rapidity of movement that Arnold demands; there is a redundancy and variety of expression, together with a constant use of rigid formulas and long repetitions,—the very presence of these opposite qualities reminding one of the early state of the poems when they had not yet been committed to writing, but lived in the memories of professional reciters; and there is, as there was, we believe, to the Greeks of the age from Pericles to Demosthenes, an obsolescence, a remoteness, about the language, such in quality as that which we feel to exist in the language of the Bible, but probably in a higher degree. We will not quarrel with Mr. Arnold because he has, perhaps, slighted these points. It seems probable that his selection of the four which he mentions, went by contraries, as it were; that is, was guided by the defects of the four principal versions which he compares and criticises. Cowper's he condemns as offending against his first canon; Pope's against the second; Chapman's against the third; and Newman's against the fourth. In general, we think his criticisms just, and we would not here enter into the particulars of the disputes which he conducts with so much energy and dogmatism against Mr. Newman and others. In his own hexameters which he offers as illustrations of his theory, he is unfortunate, but since, as he gracefully says, "from these perishable objects I feel a most Oriental detachment," we cannot criticise them. There is, at least, one good line among them:

"So he spake, and drove with a cry his steeds into battle."

Ἡ γὰρ, καὶ ἐν πρώτοις ἰάχῃν ἔχε μώνυχας ἵππους.—*Il.* xix. 424.

And we must thank him for introducing to our knowledge a beautiful fragment of translation by Dr. Hawtrey, Provost of

Eton, which is so successful a rendering, and has so much simple beauty in itself, that no other excuse is needed for quoting it. The passage is in Il. iii. 234-244, and the translation should be compared with the original, line by line.

“Clearly the rest I behold of the dark-eyed sons of Achæa;
Known to me well are the faces of all; their names I remember;
Two, two only remain, whom I see not among the commanders,
Kastôr fleet in the car,—Polydeukês brave with the cestus,—
Own dear brethren of mine,—one parent loved us as infants.
Are they not here in the host, from the shores of Lakedæmon,
Or, though they came with the rest in ships that bound through the waters,
Dare they not enter the fight or stand in the council of Heroes,
All for fear of the shame and the taunts my crime has awakened?”
So said she;—they long since in Earth’s soft arms were reposing,
There, in their own dear land, their Fatherland, Lakedæmon.”

We turn now to Lord Derby’s translation of the Iliad, to which we devote the rest of our space. It appeared later than Mr. Arnold’s lectures, and so is not mentioned in them. It might have spoiled his quaternion of tests by making a fifth necessary. But it has so much merit and differs so much from its predecessors, that we should be glad to have Mr. Arnold’s opinion of it. It is in blank verse, iambic lines of ten syllables, and, in general, the metre is good. There are often harsh and faulty lines, as these, (viii. 402-5):

“O Heav’n, brave child of ægis-bearing Jove,
Can we ev’n now, in this their sorest need,
Refuse the Greeks our aid, by one subdued,
One single man, of pride unbearable?”

Or these again, (xi. 937 f.):

“No source, Heav’n-born Patroclus, have the Greeks
Of aid, but all must perish by their ships.”

In general, we may say, the metre is good, because every line consists of ten syllables or an equivalent, and the accent usually falls upon the natural syllable in every word. But it is not an effective metre, because it produces the impression of a mechanical movement; it is not instinct with poetic life. Scarcely a line can be pointed out that has any metrical beauty

in itself; scarcely any that will arrest and detain the eye and mind like Milton's:

"Awake! arise! or be forever fallen!"

or,

"Thrones, and imperial powers, offspring of Heav'n!"

or,

"For contemplation he and valor formed,
For softness she and sweet attractive grace;"

or like Bryant's

"Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste."

In considering the general character of the translation, let us first apply to it the four tests suggested by Arnold, thus naturally citing the same passages which he uses in comparing the translations of Cowper, Pope, Chapman, and Newman.

1. Has the translation rapidity of movement? Yes, we may answer, and that is one of its merits. No one can accuse it of dragging slowly along. Especially the speeches are given with vigor and point, they being naturally the best parts, as an English critic (*British Quarterly Review*, April, 1865) well remarks, because Lord Derby is an orator, and not a poet. This rapidity of movement is secured by avoiding the use of involved and inverted sentences, and by choosing brief and forcible expressions. This sometimes goes so far as to become a fault, in that by this quality of phrase and by the omission of conjunctions, the style is made abrupt and jerky. The first passage that Arnold quotes from Cowper, as lacking Homer's rapidity, is from the close of the eighth book:

"So numerous seemed those fires the banks between
Of Xanthus, blazing, and the fleet of Greece,
In prospect all of Troy."

We quote from Derby the lines preceding these, because they illustrate the fault of too great rapidity and jerkiness:

"As when in Heav'n, around the glittering moon,
The stars shine bright amid the breathless air;
And ev'ry crag, and ev'ry jutting peak
Stands boldly forth, and ev'ry forest glade;
Ev'n to the gates of Heav'n is opened wide
The boundless sky; shines each particular star

Distinct ; joy fills the gazing shepherd's heart.
 So bright, so thickly scattered o'er the plain,
 Before the walls of Troy, between the ships
 And Xanthus' stream, the Trojan watchfires blazed."

So the other passage quoted from Cowper as an instance of this fault of inversion or slowness (for these Arnold seems to consider identical), is in Derby's translation (xix. 461-4, in the translation) straightforward and direct enough :

"By no default of ours, nor lack of speed,
 The Trojans stripped Patroclus of his arms:
 The mighty God, fair-haired Latona's son,
 Achieved his death, and Hector's victory gained."

2. Has Lord Derby's translation plainness and directness of style? We should answer, no. It is not free from the use of conventional phrases which serve to fill out the line, but which have no representative in the original, do not add to the clearness or force of the expression, and generally make it artificial. Here we do not take the passage which Arnold criticises from Pope's translation, because it, being a passage of simple, direct oratory, is well rendered by Derby, and has nothing of this fault. But we have not to look far for instances of it. Take the passage just quoted from the eighth book. Here, in the fourth line, the phrase "*stands boldly forth*," turns the simple Greek word ἐξίστασθαι into a metaphor; in the next line "*the gates of heaven*" foists an image, and an un-Homeric one too, into the text; "*shines each particular star distinct*," intensifies and changes into a different thought the simple πάντα δὲ τ' ἰδέναι ἄστρα; and Homer's shepherd does not gaze at the stars until his heart is filled up with joy, but simply finds himself light-hearted, rejoicing in spirit, by the unconscious influence of the beautiful night. In the lines which follow these,

"A thousand fires burnt brightly; and round each
 Sat fifty warriors in the ruddy glare;
 With store of provender before them laid,
 Barley and rye, the tether'd horses stood
 Beside the cars, and waited for the morn,"

the word "*brightly*" (as well as "*so bright*," in the last line but two of the other passage) is introduced by the trans-

lator; the whole third line is a paraphrase of the single word *ἐρεπτόμενοι*, *munching* or *champing*; and the epithet "tether'd," cumbers the style by its willful intrusion, and crowds out the beautiful epithet belonging to "*morn*," *ἑσπρονον* 'HΩ. Take another instance. For *ἥ και ἐμοὶ ταῦδε πάντα μέλει, γύναι* (vi. 441), Arnold gives "Woman, I too take thought for this." But Derby spins it out into,

"Think not, dear wife, that by such thoughts as these
My heart has ne'er been wrung."

Perhaps Arnold's is bald, but Derby's is as bad as a wig or a waterfall. Let one more example suffice. A little earlier in the same book (vi. 333) Paris says to Hector: "Since you have rebuked me just far enough, and no farther, therefore I will speak to you, and do you understand and listen to me." Thus Homer, but Lord Derby has:

"Hector, I own not causeless thy rebuke;
Yet will I speak; hear thou and understand."

Here the inversion in the first line, and the antithesis implied by "*yet*" in the second, are both foreign to the original, and make the style less direct and plain.

3. Has this translation plainness and directness of thought? Yes, and in general, great fidelity to the thought of the original. In a few cases that we have noticed, a metaphor almost like one of Chapman's out-of-the-way conceits, is dragged in; as in i. 51, *βέλος ἐφίσις βάλλε* is translated "*was poured the arrowy storm*." In some cases also, the connection of clauses is changed, even to the altering of the thought sometimes. Whether this is done from carelessness, or from effort after clearness, or from stress of difficulty in translating, we cannot determine. For instance in i. 29-52, where the literal translation is, "Her will I not release; sooner even old age shall come upon her in my home, in Argos, far from her native land, plying the loom and sharing my bed;" Lord Derby has,

"Her I release not, till her youth be fled;
Within my walls, in Argos, far from home,
Her lot is cast, domestic cares to ply,
And share a master's bed."

The change of connection obliges him to introduce the idea in the words "*her lot is cast.*" Again in i. 580-3 Hêphæstus advises Hêrê to conciliate Zeus lest he be angry. "For if the thunderer of Olympus should wish to hurl us from our seats, (he could), for he is far the strongest. But do you soothe him with soft answers, then will he at once be mild to us." Now this plain thought Derby changes thus:

"Nay though Olympian Jove, the lightning's Lord,
Should hurl us from our seats (for great his power),
I yet should counsel gentle words, that so
We might propitiate best the King of Heaven."

4. Has this new version the nobility of the original? Any one who has read Arnold's lectures will remember the lively and cutting criticism with which he attacks Mr. Newman's translation of Homer on this score. No one will deny that his denunciation of this particular fault is fully supported by the examples he gives, whatever may be the merits of that translation as a whole. Yet we must confess that to us this is the least satisfactory part of his whole discussion. He does not prove, it strikes us, that Homer was never, to his Athenian readers of the age of Sophoclês, either quaint or garrulous, and that he does not, or ought not to seem so to modern scholars familiar with the Attic language of that period. The fact that Homer was, in some sense, the Bible of the Greeks, was memorized and quoted by them from childhood on through life, does not prove that his language had not to them the same flavor of quaintness, of remoteness from ordinary or literary language, which the Bible in our English version has to us now, and will have, perhaps, much more 150 years hence, that is, at a similar interval. We find in the Bible some words that have gone out of use entirely by this time, as *wot*, *leasing*, *purtenance*; others that have changed their meaning, as *prevent*; others their form, as *beoray*. Such differences as these, with others of construction and usage, make the distance between Homer and the Attic Greek. No more is it proved that Homer was never garrulous by citing the extreme garrulity of the Mediæval romancers, and asking if Homer produces the same, or in any degree a similar impression. A fair

argument would be to take up passages that are thought to have these qualities, and prove that they have not, or ought not to have in the judgment of an intelligent reader. There are passages in Homer that seem to us, after all that Arnold has to say, both quaint and garrulous. It constitutes quaintness, we think, and is a characteristic of poems designed for oral recitation, that constant repetitions should occur, sometimes of the noun in a sentence where the pronoun might have taken its place, sometimes of whole sentences and long passages, as where a message is given to Iris or to a dream, and then repeated entire by the messenger a few lines later. To the same style belongs the use of stock phrases, epithets constantly repeated with proper names, often without regard to their suiting the context. To the same homely style it is due, that when Athênê comes into the angry discussion between Achilles and Agamêmnon and stands behind Achilles, she seizes him by the hair to attract his attention (*Il. i.* 197). The humor of the poet, as when an "inextinguishable laugh" is started in Olympus at the sight of Hêphæstus hobbling around in the office of graceful Hêbê, or when in the *Odyssey* the hero avows, half complainingly, that his woes, extreme as they are, do not prevent his always having a very good appetite, is a quaint humor. And for garrulity, does not the poet purposely assume it as a characterizing tone in the long speeches of Nestor? Can we see anything else in the boasting genealogies which the heroes utter, often in the midst of the fight, than the garrulity of an early, almost childlike stage of literature? In the similes, too, how often is one of them carried through without containing some feature of description which does not bear directly upon the point of comparison, but comes in simply because it was in the poet's mental view and he could not repress it, the very essence of garrulity?

In the rest of this criticism, Arnold is in the main right,—Homer is never to an English reader prosaic, never mean or low. How much this is owing to its being all in a foreign language, and that, too, one so varied, fluent and sonorous as Homer's Greek, is an interesting question that does not occur to Mr. Arnold. Not a little, we are inclined to think, in the

passages that describe the homely operations of dressing, cooking, washing, &c., and just so much is the difficulty of translating them increased. The fact that just here all translations fail, confirms our view. The question is only which makes the least lamentable failure. Let us compare Lord Derby with the best known of his predecessors in one such passage. It is the first passage of the kind that we come to, Il. x. 21-24. "And rising he put round his body a tunic, and under his feet bound beautiful sandals, and then about him he wrapped the dark-hued skin of a huge tawny lion, which reached to his feet; and he took up his spear." Hear now the translators:

Pope.

"He rose, and first he cast his mantle round,
Next on his feet the shining sandals bound;
A lion's yellow spoils his back conceal'd;
His warlike hand a pointed javelin held."

Chapman.

"So up he rose, attired himself, and to his strong feet tied
Rich shoes, and cast upon his back a ruddy lion's hide,
So ample it his ankles reach'd, then took his royal spear."

Derby.

"He rose and o'er his body drew his vest,
And underneath his well-turned feet he bound
His sandals fair; then o'er his shoulders threw,
Down reaching to his feet, a lion's skin,
Tawny and vast; then grasped his ponderous spear."

Now which is the best? Pope is mere sing-song, becoming even turgid in the second couplet, by the use of "*spoils*," "*conceal'd*," "*held*." Chapman is spirited and flowing, unusually literal, and so simple that it preserves fairly the dignity of the original. What shall we say of Lord Derby's? The word "*vest*" with its modern meaning insults the remote antiquity of the context. Then "*sandals fair*" (what an adjective to apply to sandals!) "*down reaching*," and "*ponderous spear*," with their little inversions and smooth meaningless words are an affectation of poetry. They are a specimen of the slang of rhymers. The word "*vast*" in the last line is as much out of

place as "*vest*" in the first. Homer does not speak of a *vast* lion, or lion's skin. Does not the old Elizabethan "*Homeri Metaphrastes*" leave his rivals out of sight? We omit the other passage which we had marked to quote as illustrating this quality of Derby's translation. His fault in this respect is not that he is turgid like Pope, not that he is undignified and jogging like ballad poetry, not that he affects quaintness and a conversational style, like Mr. Newman, but that his poetry is commonplace, and often prosaic.—How terribly prosaic is the line

"Where with his wife he late *had converse held*,"

as a translation of *ὅθι ἦ ὁάριζε γυναῖκι* (Il. vi. 516): what a phrase for that charming ὁάριζε which means the talk of lovers or bosom friends.

We have thus applied to Lord Derby's translation the four principal tests proposed by Mr. Arnold, finding that it has rapidity and directness of thought, but not, in the same degree, simplicity of style and the somewhat vague quality, of which we shall speak hereafter, nobleness. There is a remark incidentally made by Arnold upon which we have a word to say. It is this: "The translator must without scruple sacrifice, where it is necessary, verbal fidelity to his original, rather than run any risk of producing, by literalness, an odd and unnatural effect." This must be done in order to secure "an essential characteristic of Homer," plainness and naturalness of thought. We wish we had space for the page of admirable illustrations with which Arnold confirms this opinion. Let us slip in one specimen. "Instead of rendering *μῆνυχας ἵππους* y Chapman's 'one-hoofed steeds,' or Mr. Newman's 'single-hoofed horses,' he must speak of horses in a way that surprises us as little as Shakespeare surprises us when he says, 'Gallop apace, you fiery-footed steeds.'" True as this principle is, it may be carried too far. Homer's use of epithets is a striking peculiarity of his style, to which we cannot accustom ourselves, so that they cease to surprise us, even in the original, without an effort. Ought not the translation to preserve, so far as possible, this feature of style? and ought we not to be willing to make the same effort to get used to it, in English? We would not de-

fend "one-hoofed," or "single-hoofed," or "voice-dividing," (Mr. Newman's translation of *μυρόπων*), for they are bad translations; but we approve Derby's "solid-footed" (Il. xxii. 162), and Tennyson's "thronèd morn" (*ἐνθρόνον* 'Hῶ, Il. viii. 565), and would rather see these epithets thus represented in a translation than omitted. Lord Derby's practice of course varies. Sometimes he omits the epithet, sometimes paraphrases it; thus he translates *ἐκ θεοῦ* 'Απόλλωνος by "of his God," in i. 14, but by "the Lord of Light" in i. 21. But too often he is painfully literal. Thus we find "many-dashing" for *πολυφλαίσβοιο* (i. 34), "naval timber," a most un-English phrase, for *νήϊον ὄρυ* (iii. 62), "down reaching to his feet" for *καθηνεκής* (x. 24). So repeatedly the expression *εὖ δ' οὐκ ἄκουε πατρίσθην* is given "nothing loth, they flew;" but surely it would be more natural in English to say, "away with willing feet they flew."

If, now, we look in this translation for those qualities of Homer's style which we suggested as deserving to be added to those mentioned by Arnold, what do we find? The "grace of ease" is present in general, perhaps so generally that we need not consider the version lacking in that quality, yet with frequent exceptions. These exceptions seem to have occurred rather from difficulty of rhythm, necessitating awkward changes in the order of words and breaking the easy flow of the sentence, than from any over-ornament or stiffness of expression. Thus in the passage (iii. 243 f.) so beautifully translated by Dr. Hawtrey, instead of his almost exact reproduction of the Greek—

"— They long since in Earth's soft arms were reposing,
There, in their own dear land, their Fatherland, Lakedæmon,"

we have in Derby—

"In Sparta they,
Their native land, beneath the sod were laid."

Similarly again, (vi. 142:)

"Then Tydeus' son, and Glaucus, in the midst,
Son of Hippolochus, stood forth to fight."

The case is somewhat the same with regard to another quality of Homer's style, the freshness of sensuous life which ani-

mates every page. This is, naturally, a quality of the subject-matter rather than of the manner, yet manifests itself in the choice of epithets, and in giving to the whole a peculiar vigor and simplicity. It is this which gives to Homer a "lively and refreshing effect," to use the words of an enthusiastic Englishman in the *London Quarterly* (Jan. 1865), "analogous to what is produced by riding an easy-paced thorough-bred through a pure and bracing air over a diversified country." Now we do not find this in Lord Derby as we ought to in the standard translation. His conventional phrases are utterly incompatible with that freshness and simplicity. On the very first page the two expressions "sad day" and "fatal strife" imply, each of them, a process of thought foreign to the Homeric style: in the first, for instance, a transfer of a certain feeling from a person to the events which inspired it, from them to their cause, from it to the day when it occurred. There is no page of Homer so wonderful for its pregnant simplicity as this first page of the *Iliad*, unless it be the first of the *Odyssey*. Sometimes the vividness of an expression or metaphor is entirely washed out in a more general phrase; thus the line "and set before us all a guest should have"—

ἔσινα εἴ οὐ παρέθεν ἄρε ἔσινοις θέμις ἐστίν,

is modernized into—

"Dispensing all the hospitable rites."

So in i. 11, Homer asks who "brought those two together to quarrel," but Derby inquires who "the fatal strife provoked"—a quite different and much less primitive metaphor.

Again, we hold it still as a belief unshaken by what Mr. Arnold has said, that there is in Homer a certain antiquity or quaintness which will be reproduced by the successful translator of Homer, when he appears. This part of Mr. Newman's theory of a translation is right, however many unfortunate blunders or follies may occur in his attempt to realize it. No one can read Homer without feeling antiquity in the very style, and this impression ought not to be lost to those who can get their knowledge of him only through their own lan-

guage. Here we touch perhaps the most delicate and dangerous part of the translator's work. He has before his eyes the warning example of Mr. Newman's attempt, which should teach him not to carry it too far, not to pass the limit of easy intelligibility and naturalness. To be able to do it at all, he must be thoroughly at home in the early stages of his own tongue; yet he must beware of forgetting, he must always remember, that most readers have not the same familiarity, lest he become unintelligible, or intelligible only by too great an effort. It will need the severest taste and the most constant watchfulness to avoid affectations, or rather, the whole thing will be an affectation unless the translator is so familiar with early English literature and so inspired by Homer that he cannot reproduce the impression that the poet makes on him except in old-time language. It will be partly in the forms of words, partly in their meanings and constructions, that this antique style will consist, partly in the use of some words which, though well understood by all readers, have disappeared entirely from common use in prose or verse.

There is another peculiarity of the Homeric style closely connected with this, yet far more difficult, if not impossible, to reproduce in an English version. We mean the wonderful redundancy of various forms, together with the constant recurrence of fixed phrases. In our formless language this feature of style is unknown. On the first page of the *Iliad* we find two forms of the dative plural of the second declension, and two of the third, two of the genitive singular of the second; seven historical tenses with the augment, and four without it; the same stem in two forms, *ελασ* and *εωλ*, as the metre requires; the same verb used in different tenses in the same sense and connection, *δίσχεσθαι* and *δίσχθαι*. There is also a great frequency of connectives in the style of Homer, (e. g., 23 in his first 21 lines, while Derby in his corresponding 27 lines has only 12), and a general fullness of expression. Thus explanations, descriptions, and demonstrative words abound far more than in the later language, all tending to make the thought distinct, vivid, and comprehensible.

These qual
of phrase, th
early date of

1. The infa
crystallized it
senses not yet
are simple. I
forms, using m
struggle for life

2. The circu
mouth to mou
there was no
Hence, too, in
were kept read
in trade, and se

For any of t
Derby's transla:
rival versions?
man's. After a
produce upon a
correct, the ear
With his old-fa
now two centuri
soul, catching th
he reproduces E
reader, as none

has faults that a
we question wh
English, "to re
effect of Homere
to in this
language.
we must
Either
and
im

because the author disclaims, apparently, all effort to meet strict requirements on that ground. As the work was done within two years, some oversights and errors of translation might be expected from such haste. But we object to it as a whole, that it is but common place poetry. It has not "the grand style." We are not of those who condemn strongly Mr. Arnold's use of this phrase. There is certainly a power of arresting and mastering the mind, an absolute elevation of thought and expression, an indefinite something, which constitutes genuine poetry of the "grand style." One may be pardoned for some vagueness in speaking of it, for it is not easy to analyze it, or to give rules for producing or determining it. This quality is what we do not find in Lord Derby, and it is the lack of it, rather than anything mean or low in his style, that makes us deny to him the requisite nobleness. There are many excellent lines in his work; let us quote the last two of the fourth book, which could hardly be better rendered in his metre:

πολλοὶ γὰρ Τρώων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἤματι κείμεν
 ἀρνέες ἐν κονίῳσι παρ' Ἀλλήλοισι τέταντο.

"For many a Trojan, many a Greek, that day
 Prone in the dust, and side by side were laid."

It is often said that only a poet can translate poetry; if true in any case, it is true of Homer, and this new attempt goes far to prove it. The Earl of Derby is not a poet, and the want of this indefinable power is felt all through his translation. Chapman, Dryden, Pope, and Cowper were poets, and in spite of their many mistakes, in spite of the unfortunate theory of translation, that of paraphrase, which the first three followed, in spite of Chapman's conceits, Dryden's looseness, Pope's wordiness, and Cowper's involved Miltonic sentences, in spite of all this, their kindred genius bursts forth sometimes in passages of surprising power, affecting the reader as Homer himself. Such is Chapman's (Il. viii. 555-9)

"As when about the silver moon, when air is free from wind,
 And stars shine clear, to whose sweet beams high prospects, and the brows
 Of all steep hills and pinnacles thrust themselves up for shows,
 And even the lowly valleys joy to glitter in their sight,

When the unmeasur'd firmament bursts to disclose her light,
And all the signs in heaven are seen that glad the shepherd's heart."

Such, in a very different style, is Pope's (Π. xii. 322-8)

"Could all our care elude the gloomy grave,
Which claims no less the fearful than the brave,
For lust of fame I should not vainly dare
In fighting fields, nor urge thy soul to war.
But since, alas! ignoble age must come,
Disease, and death's inexorable doom,
The life which others pay, let us bestow,
And give to fame, what we to nature owe;
Brave though we fall, and honor'd if we live,
Or let us glory gain, or glory give."

We can quote no such passage from Lord Derby.

ARTICLE IV.—EXPOSITORY PREACHING.

ON the subject of expository, or what we may better perhaps call commentary preaching, we have to say, as if addressing some young clerical friend :

I *Try it, by all means.* It will afford you as wide a field in which to expatiate as you can desire, and as rich as it is wide. You have the whole vast field of revealed truth over which to roam ; and, in your excursions, you will find ample room for the exercise of your varied gifts, and abundant opportunity to regale the purest tastes of the imagination and the noblest affections of the heart.

“ No pent-up Utica contracts our powers,
But the whole boundless continent is ours.”

You are not chained up to the cramping necessity of being only a formal sermonizer, a logician, a reasoner, a theologian, an automaton ; but you have the liberty of just being yourself, the whole living, breathing, glowing man, with heart throbbing, pulse beating, lungs heaving, blood circulating, nerves thrilling, and all the senses, functions, and susceptibilities of the animated being in full and unfettered play.

Nor are you confined to one particular *mode* of traversing the region before you, nor to one and the same beaten *track*. You quit the close carriage, the dusty cars, the monotonous railroad, and instead of being borne along half asleep over a dead level, through out-lying, deserted fields, across desolate and dull-looking plains, you go at liberty over hill and dale, through orchards and meadows, along by still waters, and into green pastures ; now rising to the top of Pisgah, Sinai, and Olivet ; now moving along the vales where moulder the bones of kings and patriarchs, of Joseph, of David, of Solomon, and of the prophets ; now bathing in the waters of Jordan, of Genesereth, of the Red Sea, or even of the river of life proceeding out

of the throne of God and of the Lamb ; now plucking the rose of Sharon, the lily of the valley, or a sprig of hyssop that springs out of the wall ; now tarrying for a night at Engedi, at Hebron, or at Jerusalem ; you have an endless variety, both for instruction and entertainment. You have song and parable, precept and prophecy, proverb and psalmody, history and biography, sermon and miracle, whatever is striking in individual or national life, in the inner or outer man, in providential or moral government. And you have it, not in the stiff, artificial setting of the schools, according to art and man's device, but in the pure, spontaneous, natural economy that God loves. Thus you become furnished unto every good word and work, every shade and application of truth. You carry into the pulpit, not merely a specimen brick, but the whole beautiful temple, alive with devout worshippers, resounding with the rich songs and sentiments of Zion, and full of the glory of the Lord. You take along with you, not a plucked rose, half withered in your hand, but the whole bush, growing and blooming with all the beauty and freshness of Eden. You make your hearers feel, not that they are sitting bolt upright in the slips of a meeting-house, according to the conventional proprieties of the occasion, but that they are rambling at liberty with you over the luxuriant fields of scripture, breathing the fresh and balmy air, absorbed with the ever-varying scenes of interest and glory that open before them—standing, perhaps, by the pool of Bethesda—watching the Saviour's miracles—listening to the gracious words of his mouth—looking into the faces of the wonder-stricken apostles, of the charmed and astonished multitude, of the scowling and self-conceited Pharisees—going with him in tender sympathy and fellowship to Bethany, to Gethsemane, to Calvary, to Emmaus, to heaven—now bowing before his cross, now bathing his feet with tears, now exulting with the angels in his triumphant ascension to the right hand of the Majesty on high. You make them forget where they are, while they seem to themselves to be where they are not. They are at the cave of Machpelah ; they are in the congregation of Israel at the foot of the mount ; they are engaged with the workmen in building the

tabernacle or the temple; they are marching around the walls of Jericho; they are with Jeremiah in the dungeon; they are with Ezekiel by the river of Chebar; they are with the storm-tossed disciples on the lake; they are with the beloved John in the Isle of Patmos; they are walking the streets of the New Jerusalem; they are anywhere you please to take them, in sympathy with any scene you choose to portray, not knowing for the time whether they are at home or abroad, in the body or out of the body. They go with you where you go; they are entranced by the visions that you behold; they feel the truths and sentiments that you express; and old things become new, and fresh, and vivid to their minds as a present reality. And thus you can teach the soundest doctrines, and even the hardest doctrines, without their suspecting, for the moment, that you are aiming to be doctrinal at all. You can impress them with a sense of *native depravity*, by showing them human nature, as depicted to the very life, in the Bible. You can make them feel what *repentance* is, by taking them to Bochim, by mingling among the captives by the rivers of Babylon, by being present when Peter preaches on the day of Pentecost, and by reproducing the imagery and spirit of many a miracle, parable, and narrative. You can bring out *faith* to their apprehension, in the life of Abraham, Moses, Daniel, the Syro-Phœnician woman, and in a multitude of instances, under a great variety of circumstances and influences. You can show the difference between a *weak faith* and a *strong faith*, by contrasting Gideon before he went down by stealth to the host of the Midianites, and overheard the story of the barley-cake dream, and after his return from that reconnoissance; by marking the difference between the Israelites in the wilderness and the Israelites on the other side of Jordan; by comparing the nobleman and the centurion; and the like. "Come down and heal my son," said the nobleman, not having sufficient faith to believe that Christ could heal him at a distance; and Jesus would not go. "I am not worthy that thou shouldst come under my roof, but speak the word only, and my servant shall be healed," said the centurion; and Jesus was ready to go with him in a moment. Specimens of *unbelief* also are exhibited everywhere in the scrip-

tures, and in almost every conceivable form and degree. And the difference between a *true* and a *false* faith may be seen in the marching of the Israelites into the trough of the Red Sea, on the ground of a divine warrant, and the Egyptians doing the same thing in following after, without any such warrant; as also by comparing the offerings of Abel and Cain; the incense burning of Nadab and Abihu, and that of the priests; the motives of Simon Magus, and those of the apostles; and other instances. You can preach the doctrine of *election* by contrasting Jacob with Esau, the children of Israel with other nations, the penitent with the impenitent thief on the cross, and so on. You have an example of *imputed righteousness* in the treatment of the returned prodigal; and of its being despised and rejected in the case of the man without the wedding garment. You have *the saint's perseverance* in the recovery of David and Peter after their fall, and in the steadfast adherence of the apostles to Christ, when many of his disciples went back and walked no more with him. There is no doctrine, no case of conscience, no point of ethics, no sin or foible in human nature or actual life, that you cannot hit off in the most effectual, inoffensive, matter-of-fact way, by some arrow drawn directly from the quiver of the Bible. And when your hearers see that you are using God's armory, and no other, they will meekly and humbly submit to the two-edged blows, even if they do cut to the quick.

And besides, you will make them *fall in love with the Bible*. It will be a new book to them, full of life-like pictures that they had never before observed; and they will go home to search it as for hid treasures, and will *find* them, too. "I had no idea there was so much in it," says one. "We men of business, who are mostly engaged in secular pursuits, should never have fished up these pearls for ourselves," says another. "How entertaining, as well as instructive," says a third; "it is equal to a romance." The people perhaps know enough about the Westminster Catechism, and the five points of Calvinism; but they generally know quite too little about the Bible—its imagery and symbol, its poetry and narrative, its exhibitions of God in the perfections of his character, and in his ever-pres-

ent, working relations to our world—its portraiture of divine nature and human nature, of sin and Satan, of grace and redemption, of heaven and hell. And how very different is a fundamental doctrine to the common mind, when seen in its fitting biblical surroundings, from what it is when taken out therefrom, and exhibited by itself! The difference is as that between a living man and a skeleton; between the oak growing up majestically in its native forest, its roots and branches gracefully intertwined with those of other trees, and an oak standing out alone in the clearing, stunted, gnarled, and perhaps girdled, and half dead at the best. What did Paul say to Timothy? “Preach the word”—the Bible. He did not say homiletics, theology, the systems of the schools, but the Bible. *Study* theology, and exegesis, and Paul’s doctrinal epistles—no matter how much; but in the pulpit *preach* the living Christ; preach the picturesque Bible; preach religion as it is, or should be, on the stage of common, acting humanity.

And by this course, moreover, you become a practical and model Sabbath School teacher; a teacher of *teachers* as well as of pupils, of parents as well as of children. Your whole congregation, in fact, are converted, for the time, into a Sabbath school Bible class, and you are explaining to them the lesson of the day. They are interested, they are charmed, they look you up in the eye, they hang on your lips; they feel that they are fed, not with the dry husks of man’s production, but with the fresh manna from heaven, with “water out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock.” The teachers of the school are thereby taught how to teach, and the pupils are taught how to learn, and all are taught to love the Bible and to study it. You have a better Sabbath school in consequence; you have more interest in the lesson at home; you have a better knowledge and understanding of the scriptures generally among the people; you have a more fresh and vigorous type of piety in the church; and you have a hold upon all the congregation which may greatly help in drawing them to Christ. *Try it, by all means.* God’s word is truth, sanctifying truth, and wonderfully adapted to the capacities, sympathies, and affections of human nature.

II. And *how*, in the next place, should this kind of preaching be conducted? It should be *extempore*, if possible, that so it may be all the more natural and life-like. Have no manuscript, no notes, no skeleton to fetter your intellect, or to tie down the wings of your imagination, or to hold back the gushing emotions of your heart. Have at most only a few catchwords to steady and help the memory, if it be liable to trip. To sit down in your study to write out an expository discourse is too much like going into a cave to paint a landscape. You want the inspiration of having the scene to be described vividly before you at the moment, and the feeling that hundreds of eyes are gazing at the picture as you draw it. This will suggest many fine touches which otherwise would not occur to you, many correlative truths and illustrations, which, in the dullness of retirement, would never start up to your mind. First make yourself complete master of the subject, at all points in your study, and let it be so moored to your mind that it cannot slip its cable and be driven out to sea where you cannot readily find it again, should you now and then ramble off so far as to lose sight of it for a time. Know just where it lies, and feel sure that you can return to it at your pleasure from any point of the compass, should you unexpectedly be called away to pursue a digression. This will give you a sense of freedom and independence; will make you feel that you are not the slave of your subject, but its master; that you have always reserved power enough at command which you can readily call into action, as may be necessary. You will thus rise above embarrassment, and be buoyed up with a sense of confidence and self-possession, than which scarcely anything is more indispensable to fine extempore speaking.

But when we plead for the liberty of rambling as the gale strikes, do not understand us to mean that you may be careless of order, and run away entirely from the spirit and province of your theme. Have your thoughts well marshaled, your salient points thoroughly arranged, so that you can take them up one after another without stumbling or confusion. First put them down on paper, if you like, that you may deliberately review them, and see that each one stands in its natural

and relative position. Then transfer them carefully and completely to your mind, and leave your paper at home. Go into the pulpit with the feeling of a full man, a ready man, and a correct man, and throw yourself into the charge with a good assurance of victory. Be not too anxious beforehand about the words you shall use, but having been faithful in preparation, hope and pray that it may be given you in that same hour what you shall speak. Be careful to have your mind well stored with thought, and your heart glowing with benevolent affections, and you may trust the language, for the most part, to take care of itself.

Another thing. In this kind of preaching you should take up your subjects and treat them in a free, popular manner, and never *exegetically*, as in the schools. In your private study, and for your own benefit, cut and trim on exegesis as much as you will; but never think of carrying your pruning knife and grafting tools into the desk with you; or, if you do, keep them out of sight. Common minds love to see good work when it is done, but they dislike the labor of doing it themselves, and the tedium of standing by to see how others do it. Give them the results of your study just as if you had not studied at all; and not the processes of it. Choose some portion of scripture that shall be sufficiently fruitful, and complete in itself for a discourse,—a parable, a miracle, a narrative, a scene of providence, an episode in a man's life, it may be—and then set it forth and clothe it up, truthfully indeed, but with such freshness of form and coloring as shall make it seem your own immediate creation. Read the whole account for a text, if you choose, but generally we think it better to select from it a single passage or two, and then call in the several incidents, either in your own language or that of the scripture, as you may want them. Be that as it may, your success will depend very much upon your *descriptive powers*. Be your own painter. Handle the pencil with a master's skill. Do not leave out the shrubbery, the flowers, the brook, the birds from your landscape, nor the tear, the smile, the gesture, the passionate exclamation from your portraiture of human nature. Make everything real and life-like, both to your own imagina-

tion and to that of your hearers, so that you and they shall seem to be actually present amid the scene described—intently looking at the objects presented, watching the events as they transpire, listening to catch the very tone and sentiment which the several parties express, peering into their eyes, scanning their features, sympathizing in their emotions, and eager in their expectation for the full development of the plot.

And be constantly on the alert for *practical applications* as you go along. Sometimes glide without notice, imperceptibly, from the thread of the story into the quickened sensibilities of your hearers' hearts. Sometimes when they are all alive to the imagery, symbol, or sentiment of the subject, turn suddenly from the description to appeal, and let fly an arrow between the opening joints of their harness. Take them by surprise. And keep holding up the mirror to them all the way through, that they may see themselves in seeing others who have felt and acted like them. Let them see their vileness and ingratitude of heart, in seeing what a Saviour they refuse; or an impelling motive to love him more, in seeing with what patience and tender condescension he has loved them. Let them see their blindness, in the blind men by the way-side; their moral and spiritual leprosy, in the lepers standing afar off; their impotence, in the cripple at the pool of Bethesda; their self-righteousness, in the Pharisees; their going about to devise some scheme for saving themselves, in Naaman, and many others; their procrastination in Felix; their indecision in the man who wished to go first and bury his father before he would follow Christ; their love of the world more than their love of God, in the young ruler; their cruel mockery and abuse of the Saviour, in the spirit and conduct of them that crucified him. Carry them all round into the secret windings and labyrinths of their hearts, by carrying them all round among the various images and representations of the scripture; and they will go home with the feeling, "We have seen ourselves to-day." "We have been with God to-day." "We have been at the cross; we have been in Heaven; we have been in Hell to-day." They will feel that religion is a living, practical, solemn reality, not a mere theological doctrine or

theory.—That such kind of preaching is best adapted to immediate serious impression is evident from the fact that ministers almost intuitively resort to it more than usual in seasons of special religious interest. They are apt to drop their logical, didactic modes of discourse at such times, and just arm themselves with the drawn sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God as it is.

The great difficulty in this matter is, that it really requires years of study and familiar acquaintance with the scriptures to fill a man's treasury so full of their riches that he can draw out and spend with unsparing profusion, and yet all the time have more abundance instead of becoming impoverished. It is not enough to have studied the subject immediately under review; but you want drafts at sight on the whole repository of the Bible, that you may call them in to your help as occasion may require. It is true that each member of the body is in some sense complete in itself; but still "the eye cannot say to the hand I have no need of thee; nor again the head to the feet, I have no need of you. Nay, much more those members of the body which seem to be more feeble are necessary." The fact is, we want at command the whole living Bible, "fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part," making increase of the body of a discourse unto the edifying of the people in knowledge and in grace. When you cut out an eye from its natural socket in the Bible, and hold it up separately and nakedly before a congregation, you may call it the same eye that it was before, and yet it is not the same. It is no longer the living organ, the light of the body. Its peculiar significance of expression is not there. Its beaming, intelligent, penetrating look is not there. It is dull; it is motionless; it is dead. And every one feels its loss of interest to the mind. If you take one of Truth's eyes for your subject, you must show it as it is *in* truth, a living eye, properly set in its place, vitally connected by nerves and ligaments with the head and brain, freely turning every way to catch the desired objects of vision, enlightening and guiding the whole body, almost speaking by its power of expression, and search-

ing the very heart as with a candle, by its penetration. But to do such things well requires great familiarity with the whole Scriptures. And one important beneficial effect of attempting to preach in this manner would be to engage ministers in a more careful and thorough study of the Bible, the want of which, we are persuaded, is one grand defect, both in the seminary and pastoral life. Preachers, generally, are not sufficiently at home in the Bible. They are not like Apollos, as much as they should be, "mighty in the Scriptures." They preach themselves too much, and the word of God too little. They *are scholars* in the pulpit, but they are not natural men; and the people do not more than half recognize or understand them. Study and preaching of the Scriptures would make them none the less scholars, while it would make them much more genial, practical, effective men. Therefore, let the young minister begin as he can, and grow as he will, in the knowledge and skillful use of God's own word.

And people, too, need to become better acquainted with the Bible. They have generally no idea what an exhaustless storehouse of all riches for the mind it is. While it is the revelation of divine truth, it is also the grand repository of common sense; and this, next to saving grace in the heart, is one of the best equipments that men can have for the duties and difficulties of life. They naturally look to the pulpit for an introduction to the "feast of fat things" that God has prepared for them, and they ought not to look in vain. Throw open the door to them; bid them welcome to the best of all kinds; wait on them considerately and bountifully to such as they like, and such as they need; and verily they shall be fed.

ARTICLE V.—SAMUEL FISK.

Discourses delivered at the Funeral of Rev. Samuel Fisk,
Pastor of the Congregational Church in Madison. By Rev.
W. S. TYLER, Professor in Amherst College, and Rev. W.
T. EUSTIS, Pastor of Chapel street Church, New Haven.
May, 1864.

Mr. Dunn Browne's Experiences in the Army. 12mo. pp.
385. Nichols & Noyes, Publishers. Boston: 1865.

BACK of the royal city of Munich, across the green Theresian meadows, stands the stately Ruhmeshalle, a beautiful open pillared temple, devoted to the glory of those who have most worthily served their native land. There are placed the marble busts of the men, who, by their deeds in arms or in arts, in science or letters or benevolence, have left a memory which should be immortal. In front of this Doric building, which incloses three sides of a square, rises the colossal statue of Bavaria, a bronze figure, fifty-four feet high, with a sheathed sword in her right hand, at which, also, sits the Bavarian lion, while her left hand holds aloft a wreath of glory, as if ready to confer it upon the worthy who are to be admitted to immortal places in the Ruhmeshalle.

In our land we have no columned hall to receive the statues of our honored and martyred dead. The old hall of Independence is indeed filled with portraits of the revolutionary heroes. Lately a new picture has been hung on the old walls, the portrait of a hero in these more than revolutionary days, of one brave, young, full of patriotic devotion, both willing to be sacrificed for his country, and now actually sacrificed; one of many, who, by this war, shall pass to a sublime apotheosis in our thought. We are to receive a great inheritance of heroes. Names are already waxing grandly historic, and ranking chief in our national annals. The glory of the fathers is paralleled by the fresher glory of the sons. As our

eventful struggle for the life of a full-grown nation was more significant than its natal conflict, so will the foremost actors in it, who have fulfilled their opportunity, stand out in larger measure in history than their predecessors.

How are they to be honored? Independence Hall cannot contain their portraits, even if it were desirable that it should. It is considered by some an intrusion that even one has been suspended there. No other building is ready for their memorials in marble or on canvas, in pictured windows and storied bas-reliefs and emblematic offerings of love and pride. It is suggested, indeed, that a new hall should be prepared in the pile of public buildings belonging to Independence Hall, for the reception of national statuary and private votive offerings in honor of those who have given their lives for their country. The States, also, are projecting the erection of enduring monuments to commemorate the patriotic services of their sons. And our universities and colleges have, with grateful and unanimous decision, proposed to hallow within their precincts the undying memory of scholars who have not withheld the choicest culture and the grace of learning from their imperiled land. While family and private love will consecrate in unnumbered forms its tender memorials to the lost. In a lonely graveyard of Pennsylvania, a mother has placed this inscription for her only son, "A willing sacrifice to the great principle of Liberty." So, all over the land, shall there be the enduring and suggestive monuments of our patriotic dead. And all this is well.

Yet something more should be undertaken. The nation is great. Its immortal citizens, who have given their lives for its life, should receive honor befitting its greatness. Let halls of glory and temples of sacred affection be consecrated to their memory; let marble and granite be piled in enduring forms in their honor; let every hallowed spot all over the land be rendered more precious by tender memorials of martyred patriots: yet more remains still to be done. It accords with the genius of our institutions and with the methods of our people, that there should be written memoirs of the patriots, that an heroic Literature should embalm their deeds in books to be

read through all the generations, that our cultured penmen, historians, and biographers, and philosophical annalists, and graceful literateurs should give back to the nation the lives of its lost sons, in works which will commemorate forever the foremost struggle of history with all the sublime endurances and achievements of its successful actors.

In other lands, it might be enough to distinguish the virtues and the exploits of patriots by monuments which would make their appeal to the senses alone; but our people are a reading people, and profounder impressions can be made on the popular thought and emotions through a high order of patriotic memoirs, than by any erection of bronze or marble. In our land, far more than in any other, are there multitudes who can say,

"My Library
Was dukedom large enough."

And in no method can we so permanently honor the heroes as by filling the land with books, which are the urns of minds which cannot die. Other memorials will feel the waste of time, but books are that

"Gold of the dead
Which time doth still disperse but not devour."

They will educate the nation to an unending honor of those whom we lament to-day. They will make these eventful times foremost in the devotion of patriotism, in the long and sanguinary struggle of liberty, and in the charities of Christian benevolence. They will so celebrate the marvelous endurances and the vicarious sufferings of these years of weary war, as to make our land the altar of the world.

We plead, then, for a literature of the great war by our sturdiest thinkers, our scholars of largest culture, our most vigorous writers, which shall be first amongst the works of genius and labor, and which shall hand down to liberty-loving men, through the ages, the portraits of our heroic dead.

It is with the hope of stimulating an able pen to undertake the pleasant task of giving to our countrymen an elaborate memoir of one of the noblest of the heroes, that we present this monograph in the pages of this Quarterly.

SAMUEL FISK was born in the town of Shelburne, Mass., on July 23d, 1828. His father, Deacon David Fisk, and his mother, Laura Severance, were of the old Puritan stock of that sturdy Commonwealth, whose genealogy runs back, along a line of godly families, to the planting of New England; intelligent, thoughtful, earnest, pious, benevolent, who had given themselves to God, and who welcomed their children as gifts from Him, to be given back to Him with such graces of character and discipline of mind, as faithful parental training, aided by the Holy Spirit, whose control they sought, could secure, for a life-work of honor and usefulness. Born of such a parentage the child was sure of his future. His first year was one of critical uncertainty, life and death struggling for him with doubtful issue. A disease, which was then called "*Marasmus*," a sort of consumption, had fastened itself upon him, and for three weary months, lights and watchers were not dispensed with for a night. No professional diagnosis, or skill, or applied remedy rescued him, as it seemed. Perhaps we cannot say that prayer accomplished the result; but there were those who believed it, and there are some still alive who love to remember the day of prayer which they regarded as a new birth-day for the boy. For several days his death had been hourly looked for, and even his grave clothes were made ready. On a Sabbath-day kind friends and neighbors had, one by one, dropped in to see him die, and while they were quietly waiting for the event, they were several times moved, as by a common influence, to pray with great earnestness for the child's life, and for his future usefulness. Fourteen prayers were in this way offered during the day in that house, in which many united hearts joined, as in so many prayer-meetings, for that precious life. Of six children, the parents had already lost three, and there was great sympathy for them, which, with the love for the child himself, led to very urgent pleading that he might be spared to them and for the cause of Christ in the world. He was spared.

On account of his delicate health he was not sent to school as early as was usual in those days, but he learned readily at home; finding his own way easily along the rudimental paths,

as he afterward did through the abstruse problems of science, and the philosophy of the dead and living tongues of men. Bible stories, as he heard them read in the family, were his delight; and when his father's household removed to Ohio, before Samuel was four years of age, journeying by the canal in the slow method of that time, he beguiled the weariness of many an hour for his fellow passengers by the grace of diction and the wonderful tone of truthfulness with which he would recite the Scriptural stories, giving them vivid meanings, and almost new interpretations by his child's presentation of the old narratives. Standing up amidst his charmed auditory, he was even then, at three years of age, "the boy-preacher," as he was called when he began his professional work in later life. But though not put to school, he was still at school. The books of his elder brothers and sisters lay around the house, and he entertained himself by mastering their contents. In this way he became familiar with the primary studies. With no help from any one, he slyly went through the four ground rules of Arithmetic. After his school days began, he was always far in advance of his supposed position. He recited in Arithmetic with his class; but, at the same time, he was quietly studying Algebra by his mother's spinning wheel at home. His lessons were in a history for beginners; but in odd hours he was reading Rollin, and storing the voluminous records in his retentive memory. When he was ten years of age he became a pupil of Fidelia Fisk, the eminent missionary afterward to the Nestorians, an accomplished teacher in her own tongue, as she was also in the strange speech of the people to whom she gave a precious life. The teacher and the scholar were matched. In her the boy found one who could safely lead him onward. In him she saw a mind worthy of her training, and whose course from that time forward she watched with a sister's affection and admiration. She used to say of him that he was one-half of her school. He bounded through one book after another, while his school-mates were plodding wearily along. After school hours they alone read the Prophets together, she wondering the while both at the grandeur of their visions, and at

the insight of the pupil who stood spell-bound by her side. When, after weary years, the tired missionary came home to rest, and, as it proved, to die, it was in her heart to write some memoirs of those days with one who, in sacrifice for his country, had gone to his reward before her.

His studies were directed to a preparation for college, where he might have been entered years before he presented himself as a student at Amherst, but for his health, which was built up by the out-door life and labor of his father's farm. He was sixteen years of age at his matriculation, in 1844. Once within the college walls, he felt at home. The heights of learning to him were not dizzy. The language of ancient orators, and poets, and historians, was like a mother tongue. The sciences spoke to him as a familiar friend. The mathematics, which delighted him as he sat by the old spinning-wheel, only grew in pleasantness as their problems became vaster. He loved to weigh the stars. The college libraries had no warmer admirer. It was always astonishing how he mastered books. It seemed as though he had only to start with a writer to know what course he would follow, and what conclusions would be reached. There was very little that is worth reading which he had not sometime read. He easily took the first rank in his class, although with many disadvantages. His health was all the time frail, and he kept up a masterful struggle for the sinews of war. He was an aid-society for himself. He was of too generous a quality to draw largely upon the means of his laborious parents whose numerous family required their care. So he worked his own way in part, teaching somewhat, laboring in a printing office also, and improving opportunities to assist himself. All this consumed much valuable time. In one of his humorous letters he wrote, "There is nothing going on in college, except old Father Time." He certainly kept step with that venerable ancestor. After a severe sickness, during his Senior year, he wrote an amusing letter to some friends who had conditionally made him valuable promises, in which he announced that he had given up all hope of the valedictory, and consoled himself and them by the reflection that college honors were poor pos-

sessions, and that the grapes were undoubtedly sour. The first appointment was given to another, and he spoke the Latin salutatory oration, which sparkled with his wit and rung with the sonorous diction of that royal tongue. His appearance at this commencement was marked. Small in stature, he had also a boyish look, which made him seem to be the youngest member of his class, while his performance indicated the highest rank of scholarship. He spoke well and carried the audience with him, grave men as well as gay maidens.

In his sophomore year, after sore travail, with throes and pangs of mind, he was born again. His experience was clear, and he became a decided Christian. From that time he looked forward cheerfully to the ministry as his profession. His attainments were for his wider usefulness: himself was Christ's.

He entered the seminary at Andover, from which he wrote early in his course, evidently thinking of the missionary life: "I will try and get prepared as well as possible for any field and then take hold of God's hand and let Him lead me to the right place in His vineyard." His life at Andover was overflowing with delight. He enjoyed the society and the instructions of the professors; he reveled in the wealth of the seminary library; all tasks were pleasures; his classmates were friends; while the magnificence of nature filled his soul with devout exultation. He entered on his Biblical studies with something of the earnestness with which the miner works along the lodes which are rich with treasure and richer with promise. "I had no idea," he wrote from the seminary, "that the Bible was such a hard study. It takes, sometimes, a long, strong pull of faith to root up the stumbling-blocks and roll them over."

"From a sense of duty" he left Andover for a short time to teach in the academy at Shelburne Falls. "As I teach only six hours a day," he writes, "I take Hebrew and Greek in an evening, each alternately, and fill up leisure moments in the day with French." He inherited and cultivated an uncompromising industry. From Andover, Mr. Fisk went back to Amherst as a tutor in the college. His appearance was so youthful and his manner so naive that he was mistaken for a student just entering upon his course, nor was the mistake dis-

covered until he was recognized, by those who had patronizingly approached him, in the tutor's desk. Any one was safe, however, in his hands. He was a successful instructor; for he gained the hearts of his pupils, and then carried their minds with his own to the tasks which were in hand. During his tutorship he preached, not only in the college pulpit occasionally, but in the neighboring towns as well, when a parish needed assistance for a Sabbath service. It was at this time that he became somewhat noted as the "boy preacher" among the hill-towns of Massachusetts, a title due to his stature and his youthful looks. His preaching was original. His style had a kind of quaintness which gave his productions relish and attracted attention. His mind worked after his own methods, and so the old truth took new forms, while the substance remained the same. He was a pleasing speaker, rising at times into an impressive eloquence.

His studies had led him to love the old lands where the world's history began, which had been made sacred by the voices of prophets and the blood of martyrs, and the work of patriots and of scholars; and he longed to visit them. In the summer of 1855, he embarked on the ship *Quickstep* for the Eastern world. During his three years' tutorship at Amherst, he had advanced in scholarly attainments, and he desired before he should settle in his profession, to add to his culture the rich lessons of foreign residence and travel. The narrative of his journey was published in his "*Experiences in Foreign Parts*," which he wrote over the signature of Dunn Browne, a *nom de plume* which has since been the synonym of wit and humor, hardly paralleled by any of our younger writers for the public press. He visited, during fifteen months of travel, most of the countries of Europe, together with Egypt and Palestine, remaining for some months in Paris and in Germany for the prosecution of his studies. Wherever he went, alone, or in the company of educated Americans, he went with his eyes open, as a shrewd observer both of men and manners, as well as of objects; his soul full of exhilaration as he passed from land to land, a stranger nowhere, a friend to all, his mind fully occupied, his active footsteps taking him every whither, the life of every circle, his humorous fancy suggesting most mirthful

conclusions, his straightforwardness carrying him through all obstructions, and his native keenness outwitting Greek, Jew, and Barbarian. Of the memorials of his journey which he brought home, hardly any are more interesting than his "Flora," gathered at all interesting localities, and carefully pressed, and on his return tastefully arranged with notes of their origin. One beautiful page he labels as those "whose locality not being precisely recollected, the reader can locate to suit his own fancy!" Among these choice souvenirs is a cobweb from the Doge's Palace, a significant memorial indeed, but one which probably no other traveler ever thought of preserving among the flowers and leaves which keep green the memory of travel. Of his book Professor Tyler justly says, "There is more of genuine wit and humor in that little unpretending volume of his *"Experiences in Foreign Parts,"* than in the collected works of some of our professed humorists, and at the same time more of a just and graphic description of foreign lands than in many a ponderous tome of tourists by profession." It is a guide-book which any traveler following in his footsteps might use to advantage, whether as suggesting places to be visited or views to be taken. Much as he loved the old lands of the Bible, and of the classics, and of the fathers, he returned to his native land not only with a deeper love for it than for all other lands, but with a more passionate admiration for it than he had before his journeyings. His patriotism took deep root; we shall see its glorious fruitage.

While he was in Syria, visiting our missionaries, it was proposed to him by some of them, who knew his fitness for the work, that he should remain there as a missionary. Especially it was thought that his linguistic attainments fitted him to become the assistant of that accomplished missionary scholar whose labors in the elegant version of the Arabic Bible were already telling upon his life. With a decision more remarkable than that of Xavier when summoned to undertake the conversion of India, in one half hour he decided to remain, abandoning his journey and his party, no more to see his native land, and the mother who bore him. There in the very midst of the work, he determined to enter upon it with all his ambition, and he would have made a most useful missionary. On

consultation, however, the missionaries decided that the course would be extraordinary and that it would be better that he should return home, and then proceed to the field in the usual way.

Soon after Mr. Fisk's return to his native land, he was called to the pastorate of the Congregational church in Madison, Conn., as the successor of the Rev. Samuel Shepard, whose long and useful ministry had been closed by his lamented death a short time previous. He accepted the call, and entered upon the responsibilities of his great work in this large parish with cheerful hopefulness. The church had been accustomed to an able ministry, but the youthful pastor was worthy to follow his predecessor. He took a high rank at once, both for the soundness of his theology, for the originality of his discourses, and for the thorough earnestness of his ministry. His people felt that a man of generous culture, of first-rate ability, of real godliness, stood before them. They knew that the pulpit was well filled. There was a masterful logic in the sermons of this new preacher which tasked their thought; there was a glowing rhetoric which roused their susceptibilities; there was a certain quaintness of style which gave a decided zest to the uttered words; there was a peculiarity of thought which excited attention; and withal there was a deep under-flow of religious experience which reached their hearts. Some men, more familiar with a form of words than with the genuine substance, swearing by a certain Shibboleth rather than grasping the living sense of things, did perhaps wonder whether this pastor were thoroughly orthodox, according to their Procrustean methods and measures. But he could not descend from his high work to their judgment seat. He carried conviction to all honest-minded hearers. He held aloft the Word of God, and above that the Cross of Christ, and so spake as a divine ambassador to men. He swept through the grand system of Christian doctrine, charging his people by all the mighty facts of revelation. Yet he came to them also as a brother, as one of them, standing on the same level, sharing in their joys and woes, and interpreting to them their needs. He made much of the divine side of the gospel; he made much of the human side as well. It is not strange that he held the hearts of his people. Chil-

dren clustered around him ; he carried a child's heart himself. The young gave him their warm confidence. In all homes he was welcomed, for his presence was like sunshine, and his words were a benediction. To those who went mourning he was a comforter, speaking to them the words of the Master ; and he quickened the pulse of age by his outgushing cheer. It was with reluctance that his parish consented that he should leave them when a louder call summoned him. It was with cheerfulness that they prolonged his release in the service of the country, rather than accept his proffered resignation. He interested himself in all that interested them. This old parish held the graves of all its pastors, and had a kind of pride about retaining its ministers till their death. So he *settled* among his people, purchasing the most picturesque spot in the village for his future homestead ; a rocky grove, with granite ledges and native forest trees in great variety, close by his church, and commanding outlooks upon the sea. Here he hoped to build and to dwell and to die, and since his death the place has been called by his name. It is a charming retreat which his quick eye caught at once, and which he would have made a spot of beauty and of joy, could he have wrought it to his standard of grace.

Like most country pastors, he had the care of the schools, in part. Visiting them, he came to one which had a bad notoriety as being the worst-governed and most unmanageable school of the town. After watching its disorder, he made "some remarks," as is the custom of visitors, in which he bore hard upon turbulent pupils, but said that this school was the most quiet and orderly and satisfactory of all the ten he had visited—*except nine !*

Mr. Fisk met his people, in all their pursuits, as one who could sympathize with them. He was familiar with all avocations, and could tell every man something which was for his advantage, which he had not known before. He worked on his own farm, and every year it smiled more broadly under his husbandry. Yet his great work was his ministry. On this he worked when the farmers were at rest. On this he went from house to house, and from heart to heart, *winning souls*. God owned his ministry. The Spirit quickened the

word. Many were added to the Lord. In these harvest times the soul of the young pastor was surcharged with care and love. He labored together with God. His parish prospered, and many remain to bless his ministry, which the Master also blessed.

From his post of observation he kept a keen outlook upon the great struggle of his country for its life, when gigantic rebellion put forth its protracted and determined energies to rend the land. In strong prayer he bore up our cause; with earnest words he intoned the popular sentiment, and by all means quickened the heart-beat of his people and of others to a prompt sympathy with the nation in its stern struggle with its persistent and malignant foes. His pulpit rang with patriotism. His conversation was for his country. His heart went out to our noble soldiery. When victory came, his eyes sparkled with a new lustre, and his footstep was elastic. When the tidings of defeat rolled like a wave over the gloomy land, he walked despondent and like one in affliction. At length he could not resist the call of patriotism. It was in the darkest period of our contest, when the issue seemed most doubtful, when our armies were rolled back before the exulting hosts of rebellion, when few comparatively were ready to volunteer, long after the romantic adventures of war had passed into awful reality, when steady principle alone could sustain the Government, that this young pastor decided to forsake his church, to forsake his youthful wife and his infant child, to forsake his books and his work and his associates, for the endurances of the battle field. He could not see his country go down. He felt that the best lives must be offered, if need be, to save it. He saw that the foremost men, sometimes even the ministers of Christ, must give themselves to this cause, that so all other men might willingly give themselves. He decided to enter the armies of the Republic. He did it in prayer, and in reliance upon God. To him the act was as solemn as a sacrament. As he supposed, it had an influence in all the region. Not only from his own parish, but from neighboring parishes, the young men joined him and proceeded to the war. They felt that if the call took such a man as Mr. Fisk, it must mean them also. And they thought if they were to go, it would be well to go

with such a soldier. He sought at first a chaplaincy, feeling that it would be more meet for one who went from a place like his. But there were many candidates before him. He then enlisted as a private, as did many young men of his own parish. He was immediately elected Second Lieutenant, then First Lieutenant, and afterward Captain, in the Fourteenth Connecticut Volunteers. He was, for a season, Assistant Inspector General of the Brigade, and afterward an officer on the staff of Gen. Carroll, as also on that of Gen. Hays. His regiment moved into the field at once, and had a part in the great battles which fell to the brave Army of the Potomac, including those of Antietam, of Fredericksburg, of Chancellorsville, of Gettysburg, of the Wilderness. At Chancellorsville, Captain Fisk was captured and sent to the Libby Prison at Richmond. He was released in time to march with his men for the defense of Pennsylvania, and through the terrible battles of Gettysburg he rode, as an aid, in the thick of peril, and, though constantly exposed, dashing everywhere over the battle-field on his white horse, he escaped without a scar. He was thoroughly impatient that Lee was not hotly pursued and beaten after these battles, chafing that we could not strike then and there the blow which would have ended the rebellion. But God's providence moves slowly in its relentless destinies.

The armies went into winter quarters. Captain Fisk enjoyed there the society of his family, for whose accommodation his boys erected a comfortable hut; and on their return he visited, on leave of absence, his friends, his parish, his beloved parents. Everywhere he spoke cheerfully of the service, decidedly of the issue of the war, but rather sadly of the task which he saw the opening spring would devolve upon himself and his companions in arms. He knew that hard fighting was at hand; that by the most terrible battles only could the military power of the confederacy be broken; that sweet peace must come by bloody victory. His mind was decided as to his own part in the arduous work, and that decision sobered him; the brightness of his face was shadowed, and he seemed to have a presentiment that out of the carnage he might not come; he

knew that many whom he loved would not. Not the less determinedly did he return to the Rapidan. He went back as the ancient martyrs went to their endurances. He went as confessors had been wont to go before their persecutors. He went as he himself would have gone to any solemn duty. It was the grandest moment of his life. It was the very crown of all his attainments. The future rayed back its experience upon the present. The parting was unlike all previous ones.

During the winter, while they lay on the Rapidan, waiting for the spring to summon them "on to Richmond," the officers of the regiment unanimously elected him as Chaplain. It was a position that he had sought when he first thought of entering the army; but he resolutely declined it now. He had all along been as a chaplain to his comrades; been more than a chaplain could be. He had been a Christian officer, illustrating in camp and on the march and in battle the noblest religious character. He decidedly rebuked all the vices of the army. He gently soothed the sick and wounded; prayed with the dying, and over the dead. Touching memories of him have been recalled in our hospitals at the mention of his name. "O," said one in Washington, "he is the man who put his arm around me so kindly, and begged me to promise him that I would never utter another oath; and I never have." Said another: "Captain Fisk—O, yes! he helped me off the field after that dreadful battle, gave me his blanket, and spoke kind words of cheer that helped to keep me alive." Multitudes could testify of his fidelity to them. It was his daily duty to care both for the bodies and the souls of all about him. We knew, said his boys, that he loved us. Said one of our Generals: "I loved him better than any man in the army." Said the General on whose staff he served, "When he was in my little military family, we often had generals and colonels to dine with us; but whoever were the guests, I always asked the Captain to say *grace*—not that I cared for it, but out of respect to his religion—and he never declined. Sometimes, when we were on short rations, I used to rally him, suggesting that the *grace* should not exceed the rations; but he was never offended, and always demeaned himself like a Christian. He had the right

kind of religion." So, before officers and soldiers he stood as the representative of Christ, and he accomplished more for the Master and for the men than if he had been officially their chaplain. In this opinion of others he himself shared. But it was not this which principally moved him to decline the chaplaincy. He knew that his own company would regret his removal from the command of them. He knew that many young men, some of them his own parishioners, must meet fiery trials in the campaign which was to open. His duty was with them. He would share their lot; if it must be so, their fate. As captain, he would be chaplain. He would carry Christ into the forefront of battle; he would lift up his prayers with his huzzas, as he cheered his brave boys in the thick of peril. It was on this ground that he resolutely, heroically decided.

The campaign opened, as he foresaw it must, with the severest fighting of the war. Under the gallant Gen. Hancock, his regiment was assigned to responsible and dangerous duty. No man among all the veterans in that renowned corps was more courageous and hopeful and determined than Captain Fisk. His last act, before he crossed the fatal river, was the partaking of the Supper of our Lord with his fellow-disciples. With true Christian devotion, he proceeded to offer himself, a vicarious sufferer, in humble imitation of his Master, for the land of his birth and love.

It was in the first of the great battles of the Wilderness that he fell. Encouraging his men and leading them forward, he had advanced to the very front of our lines. One furious charge of the enemy, and still another, had been successfully repulsed, when our lines broke, and one company after another retreated. Captain Fisk still held his ground, almost alone, unwilling to give way, rallying his men with cheerful voice, and determined to win victory. It was then that he received his wound, coolly, bravely trying by his own heroic determination to save the field; and he was borne back to the hospital. At length, suffering severely in the removal, he was taken to Fredericksburg, where all that skill and kind attention and earnest prayer could do, was done for his recovery. His beloved wife, a sister, and a brother joined their tender minis-

tries at his bedside. Soon after the arrival of his sister, he said to her, "I don't know but the Lord is going to take me through this, after all." "But," she said, "you are not anxious about that?" "O, no! I am *perfectly* willing to die," was his earnest reply. On the next day he said, "I should really like to recover, for many reasons, but am willing to go." To Bishop McIlvane, who called to see him, he said, "Christ is a present help. Living or dying I can put my trust in him." In answer to a question of the Bishop's, he replied: "Had I not been willing to give my life for my country, I should not have gone to the war."

Tender were his parting words to the loved ones who were with him; precious his messages to those who were absent. Glorious were his anticipations. Death brought no dismay to him. He had long been accustomed to look upon it as a door to another world which he longed to visit. So attractive was heaven to him, that the earth held him slightly. Touching in those last days was the love he bore his country. His overflowing humor, the innocent playfulness of his heart, burst freely out amidst all his sufferings. We can here transcribe but a small part of what he said which is worthy of memorial. Much of it is too sacred for public repetition. Speaking of one of the days when he lay in the hospital, he said: "I lay there so soothed! I thought of everybody and everything. I heard the birds sing through the shutters so pleasantly! and many things pleasant I heard, *a great way farther up*. I thought I should die before night, and I was very happy." "Once," writes his sister, "I requested him not to *thank* me for every little attention. Quick as a flash came the 'Thank you, I wont.'" On the day before his death he thought he should then die, and he said to a friend who had faithfully cared for him: "You have done all you could to save my life. I thank you. Now make *your* life an earnest Christian one." To another: "Doctor, you have done all you could to save me. I am obliged to you. Give my love to all your friends." "It is pleasant to have so many precious friends around me." Naming many friends, he sent to them personally his love. "I shall soon be in the New World, and know all about its

glories." "What news from the front?" was his frequent inquiry. "Well, I can't fight any more. The rest must do it, *taking right hold of it.*" He wished to be told frankly how matters were with our armies, bearing on his great heart, to the last, the cause for which he was dying.

It was on the Sabbath that he died. In the morning it was said to him: "Many prayers will go up for you to-day, from your church in Madison, from Shelburne, and Charlemont, and Philadelphia." With his own smile, he answered: "It will be a perfect *string* of prayers, wont it?" Waking from sleep, he said, smiling: "I think I shall get my order to-day. Don't *you* think so? I mean my great order." Afterward: "Death can't be far off now. Heaven is a better country than this. Do you think it will be heaven *right off*?" "I shall soon be there, and *all about it.*" "Plant flowers on my grave." "Give General Carroll my love. Tell him I am perfectly willing to go or stay, as God wills, and hope it is the same with him." "This is the end, I suppose." "All is well." "My *dear* father and mother, and all the loved ones—how I love them all!" He repeated some lines of the hymns, "Jesus, lover of my soul," and "Rock of ages, cleft for me." Looking from one to another, in a clear voice he said: "*Good* bye! *good* bye!" "Perfectly, perfectly," was his reiterated expression of his trust in the Saviour, and these were his last words on earth.

Wrote one who was with him to the last: "Those still Sabbath hours were more sacred than any I have ever known, especially from two o'clock P. M. to twenty minutes past six, when our precious one passed through the pearly gates, which had seemed to stand ajar for hours. Did he not really *see*, through those opening gates, glories that held his enraptured vision, even before he had ceased to look upon us? Otherwise I cannot believe, as I think of those widely-opened, earnest eyes, looking upward so intently, till a beautiful light seemed reflected upon his own face while he gazed. Twice, at least, that radiant, unearthly smile, that I have never seen except on the countenance of a dying Christian, came over his features, so marked as to startle us almost, and make us look into

each others' faces for an explanation which we all felt in our hearts. I think that no one present doubted that the *veil*, through which we longed in vain to look, was more or less removed for him, and that those smiles which we were permitted to see on the dying face were reflections from the 'heaven' that certainly was not then 'far off' from him. It is not for any pen to describe that scene. No one who was privileged to be there can ever forget it. The moment came when we listened in vain for the gentle breathing. The chest, the pulse, were quiet; the cold hand answered not to the pressure of love. For an hour it was given me to sit alone, closing the lips so prone to affectionate words and caresses, and the eyes that would no more look love into mine. It was sweet to think he was *at rest*. After a life of nearly thirty-six years, an eventful life, of some hardship and much toil, of wide travel and much study, a life, of late, of great privations and long weary marches, he had halted now, and was forever at rest. In many battles he had bravely faced the foe, and had now met the last enemy, and was victorious through Christ. Blessed end of a beautiful life! What *hour* so fitting for the Christian minister, whose Sabbaths have been all *work days*, to pass away to his eternal rest, as the evening of the holy Sabbath?"

Tidings of his death were conveyed to his General, who lay wounded in Fredericksburg, who said, overcome with emotion, "Well, when such a man dies, we know where he has gone; there is no doubt about it. Although I am not a religious man myself, I am glad to testify to such a religion as his. I never knew just such a Christian: so genial, so firm amid temptations, so cheerful under all sorts of discouragements!" His faithful John, the soldier who had been detailed to be his servant, and whom he tenderly thanked in his last hours for his unwearied kindness, bewailed his death with touching sorrow, and promised from that time to serve the Master whom his captain had always commended to him. So, from high and low, from officers and men, from wounded sufferers and from soldiers at the front of battle, one wide lament attested the sincere grief of all that the noblest man among them had fallen. Nor were those all. Letters of condolence came from

scholars and old companions and many friends, who felt that a personal grief and loss had fallen upon them. A large and affectionate parish was widowed. A large committee of gentlemen, his former parishioners, tenderly cared for his remains. His body was taken to Madison, where a funeral discourse was pronounced by the Rev. Wm. T. Eustis, of New Haven ; and thence to Shelburne Falls, his native place, in whose beautiful cemetery he desired that he might be buried. The spot had a wonderful charm for him. The hills of God rise grandly around it to the sky, in an unbroken circle. The river flows gently along the valley, and the variegated forests clothe the landscape with manifold vesture. On the Sabbath day, one week from his death, the funeral services occurred in Shelburne. Along the route to his native place, great respect had been paid to his remains. The bells of the towns had been tolled as his body was borne homeward, and many voices had expressed their sorrow, and many tears had testified to the grief of his countrymen. But on this Sabbath day, still more marked was the regard for his memory, and the sorrow of the people for the fall of a favorite hero. Professor Tyler, of Amherst College, preached a sermon tender with its personal grief and appreciation of the dead. Ministers of neighboring parishes had adjourned their services, that they and their people might honor one whose name and fame they cherished. The church could hold but a small portion of the multitude which had assembled from all the towns around. Flowers in graceful forms were piled upon his coffin. A long procession followed his body to the grave.

Our limits forbid even the outlining of the character of Samuel Fisk. Friend, scholar, wit, writer, preacher, soldier ; his life is a rare study, worthy the thought and painting of a philosophic artist. We barely allude to a few characteristics.

He possessed wonderful affectionateness. His heart seemed to be void of all selfishness, and it ran over in spontaneous and abundant love for others. He was the favorite in every circle. He drew all hearts to himself, however diverse they might be from each other. He rejoiced more in others' hap-

piness than in his own, though he was always happy. His heart was childlike, though his mind was manly. The love that he bore to his parents seemed to brighten with his years. From the Pyramids he looked toward his native place, and longed to throw his arms around his mother and tell her how he loved her. He inclosed the first money he received for preaching, in a letter to his mother, and sweetly told her how much he owed it to her that he could preach the gospel. Against the decided verdict of his class, the valedictory was given to another which they all thought belonged to him. Yet at the President's levee on commencement day, he sat with his successful friend, with his arm around his neck as usual. His affectionateness made him a rare pastor. His own love was irradiated with love of Christ.

He had an overflowing cheerfulness. It sparkled in all conditions. The more depressing the circumstances, the larger was the outgush of his mirth. His face was ever beaming; his very presence was a tonic. He carried hope in his hand; his voice was like a melody. Possessed of native wit, which seasoned all his speech, he used it for the joy of others. The arrows that he let fly, did not rankle. He was thoroughly honest in his serene mirthfulness. The secret of his unfailing cheerfulness is given in one of his letters to his mother, in one of the noblest sentiments in human language: "I am cheerful and happy, day by day, because I think God is my friend, and is doing all things rightly for me and all mine, as well as for the whole world and for the universe." This has an Edwardean tone; it is thoroughly Christian. They are great words, and they give the real secret of his life.

Words cannot attest his patriotism. His life is the record of that, and his death sealed it. When Captain Fisk decided to join the army, he wrote to his parents, "I go as at the call of God. Do not be over-anxious about us. If we live, it will be to do our duty. If we die, it will be heaven." He refers to his brother also, who had previously entered the western army. His call to the military service was as clear to him as his former call to the ministry. He felt that his country must be saved at all hazards, whoever fell. He counted not his life

dear, if that was the price of the nation's life. He clearly saw God's hand in this greatest of wars. In one of his letters we find this: "The clouds are black and thick enough near the earth, but, high above all, God's sun shines out bright. Notwithstanding our governmental corruption, I think too many good men's lives have been offered up in the contest, for the cause to fall through. They are wasted as far as human management is concerned, but not in the Lord's plan. Very precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints." His army letters, which have now been gathered into a volume, were written to awaken patriotism, to keep up the popular enthusiasm, to set our cause on a basis of principle, and to recall rulers and officers and people and soldiers to their responsibility to God. He saw that the war must be carried successfully through, and he saw slavery perishing in its triumphant progress; and he saw a golden future rising before the afflicted, stricken nation. He fought as a Christian patriot.

His love to Christ, sincere and earnest, was the crown of his life. It pervaded his whole character; it controlled all his conduct. Living or dying, he was Christ's. It comforted him in his last moments that "Christ had never forsaken him." After a battle he wrote to his mother that through it all he "felt that the everlasting arms were underneath and all around him." His best Friend was always with him. He could not fear. Death had no terror to him. To one who thought that he spoke too cheerfully of death in his remarkable letter on reading his own obituary, he wrote: "Death! why, I am not afraid of it, I hope! 'Tis my friend and yours. I *think* just as pleasantly about the subject as any other; why shouldn't I *speak* familiarly and freely about it? We have to look it in the face out here, and should be miserable and anxious all the time if we did not take cheerful views."

Unlike some persons holding high ecclesiastical positions, who declare that religion and patriotism are utterly divorced, his patriotism was not only wedded to his piety, but it grew out of it. Loving Christ *more*, he did not love his country *less*. It was, as we have said, in imitation of his Lord, that he was willing to be offered for his country; willing to lay

down his life, with many others, that millions for whom Christ died might be raised to manhood. On his coffin lay the cross, and the battle-stained flag which streamed over him in the charge of the Wilderness. There is such a thing as a Christian patriot.

We conclude this imperfect sketch with the words of Captain Fisk himself, written to his parents, in one of the darkest periods of the war : "I have faith in the cause and in the people, and in God, who overrules all, that this tremendous struggle shall not be in vain ; and if my blood is poured out, along with that of thousands of others, I shall not give it grudgingly, nor call it wasted."

ARTICLE VI.—SABBATH SCHOOL INSTRUCTION.

The Graduated Sunday School Text Books. By CHARLES E. KNOX. Outline of the Saviour's Life. I. The Primary Year. II. The Second Year. III. The Third Year. New York: A. D. F. Randolph.

A Year with St. Paul. By CHARLES E. KNOX. New York: A. D. F. Randolph.

THOSE whose experience extends over a period of two generations are accustomed to specify among the changes they have witnessed, the multiplication and enlargement of Sabbath schools. About half a century ago, and not far from the time when "the standing order" of churches in this State ceased to be recognized as such by law, the minds of Christian people began to devise measures for the religious instruction of children upon the Sabbath day in classes or schools. This innovation upon the customs of the people, in some cases, at least, met with disfavor, if not with actual opposition from the church organizations. The earliest schools are supposed to have been commenced by individuals on their own responsibility, and at their own charges; neither the brotherhood of believers nor the ecclesiastical society having any responsibility in the matter, or making any provision for the maintenance of the institution. The district school house afforded a more convenient place of assembly than any which the church could provide.

Since that day, great changes have been made in common schools and those of higher grade, in respect to books, apparatus, and methods of instruction; and similar changes are seen in Sabbath schools, and in the place they hold in Christian thought. They are now deemed indispensable as a sphere of religious activity, and equally indispensable for complete religious instruction. Christian churches of every denomination would feel that their influence was greatly abridged without the Sabbath School. And parents who should openly avow an intention of keeping their children away from the school and

directing their religious instruction themselves, would, in some quarters, be almost ostracised. Good men would shake their heads, and sigh, and say that for the good of the greater number, if for no other reason, the parents and the children should go together to the church school. The very structure of our houses of worship attests the change which has come over the people, for no such building is complete without its separate apartments conveniently arranged for all the purposes of a Sabbath school.

But this institution of so rapid and vigorous growth is not so much a *branch* of the church as it is an offshoot and sucker; it is not generally directed or controlled by the brotherhood; it is not committed to the oversight of the pastor. The course of study, the selection of hymn-books and libraries, the appointment of teachers and superintendents, are determined not by the church or its officers, but by an organization as distinct from that, as both are from the parish. Sometimes, indeed, the church elects a superintendent, but this is not the prevalent usage; sometimes it is done by the teachers; sometimes by the ballot of the whole school; sometimes the appointment is made no one knows how, or for how long; while the pastor is but a fifth wheel to a coach, a welcome visitor if he chooses to go in, but not the recognized head and leader, as he is the leader of the devotions of the church and presiding elder in its deliberations. Nor does it help the matter for him to magnify his office as a teaching brother, for usually his function of teaching is supposed to be discharged elsewhere, and there is practically no place for him *officially* in the school room. He is there by courtesy, if he makes a casual visit; he is on a level with the other teachers, if he takes a class.

In other words the Sabbath school and the church are *practically* and *generally* two institutions and not one; and this, partly because the ministers at the outset did not altogether favor Sabbath schools, and in later years have either been unwilling to intrude or have felt that they had work enough in preaching two or three times, and conducting a prayer meeting;—and partly because we have been carrying democracy to an extreme in theory, denying that the pastor is by virtue

of his office the *rector* of the church. This is in contrast with some other systems, in which the pastor, *ex officio*, is responsible for the catechizing and instruction of the youth.

It is a proper, nay, rather a serious question, whether in this vibration of the pendulum, people have not come to attach a factitious importance to the Sabbath school, making it not a means to an end, but an end itself. Various things look that way. For example, we set ourselves to write and then to sing hymns laudatory of the Sabbath school in great numbers and extravagant disproportion; while the hymns of the church are ruled out and set aside. The Rev. George Bacon in a recent essay estimates that in some collections of Sunday school music books three quarters of the hymns are devoted to the praise of the Sunday school. "In all sorts of verse and metre the dignity and worth of the school is extolled. The Sunday schools are represented as of all places in the world the most beautiful, the most fascinating, the most seductive. Children cry for them. There is the most irrepressible and ardent longing to get into them, and when they are entered to remain in them. If there is an allusion to the seasons, it is only to set forth the peculiar loveliness of the school in each of those particular seasons. Sunday schools in spring, Sunday schools in summer, Sunday schools in autumn, Sunday schools in winter, in the morning, in the afternoon,—rain or shine, wet or dry, cold or hot,—they are presented under all these phases, and their worth and glory under each and all of these circumstances especially extolled. For one hymn in which the love of God is celebrated, there are three in which the glory of the Sunday school is celebrated. For one hymn in which the love of Christ to little children is praised and thanked, there are three in which the desirableness and excellence of the Sunday school is enlarged upon."*

Then, again, what pains are taken to keep up an interest in the Sabbath school, with anniversaries, premiums, picnics, garments to the poor, Christmas trees, and the like.

Then how often we hear the lamentation that young men at

* The Sunday School Times, November 26th, 1864.

a certain age desert the Sabbath school, as if their presence or absence was the crucial test of character.

And then, again, we have the new doctrine that everybody *ought* to attend Sabbath school; that it is the place for the middle aged and the old as well as for children; and that, on the whole, people would derive more profit from a service devoted to class instruction, than from spending the same time in worship and in listening to the preaching of the truth.

It is foreign to our purpose to discuss these points: we cite them as illustrations of the tendency of the present day to magnify the importance of one institution at the expense of others.

These considerations give importance to the question whether our Sabbath school instruction at the present day is such as to justify the praises bestowed upon it; and whether we accomplish what we ought to do with a system so popular and prevalent as this is.

That we may not be misunderstood, we wish distinctly to concede that great good is done in Sabbath schools; that the study of the Scriptures at definite periods, the instruction of the poor and ignorant by refined and Christian teachers, the contact of fresh, young, believing hearts with the receptive and impressible minds of children, the learning of Scripture and of hymns by heart,—and other things inseparable from the Sabbath school, are of unspeakable value; even though the good done through these instrumentalities cannot be parceled out, and separated from that which is due to other coöperating agencies. At the same time, incidental evils,—like that of weakening parental fidelity and responsibility, and that of ill-timed and erroneous instruction,—compel us to make some limitations in the praise we bestow.

Let us now consider what is attempted in Sabbath schools, during the time of from fifty to ninety minutes of the session.

1. There is an exercise of *worship*; involving prayer, singing, and the reading of Scripture. Important things; useful in the educating of youth; yet often so managed as not to instruct, and not to help devotion. The prayer oftentimes not worded with reference to children's thoughts and necessities;

and no intimation being given to them that they have anything to do but keep still and listen. The singing is enlivening, but it is entirely a matter of chance whether it is devotional; the probability being against its having any element of prayer or praise. The reading of Scripture may have an aim, and it may not. If the Psalms are read, it may be devotionally, and the opportunity is afforded for responsive reading. If the Gospels, it may be with a barbarous mutilation of sense,—a plain narrative being chopped up into fragments, read alternately by the superintendent and the school. Even if this exercise has the merit of fixing attention and giving all something to do, it can hardly be said to be either worship or instruction. Such an exercise as this, in common schools and in our Sunday schools, may be preparing our congregations for elaborate liturgical services; but if we were advocating that result, we should say by all means take devotional passages, and not mere narratives.

2. Next, benevolent contributions are to be taken whenever it best suits the convenience of the treasurer.

3. Then books are to be exchanged and reissued. The method, quite likely, will be one which interrupts the teacher in the very midst of the lesson. Perhaps instruction must be entirely suspended until each scholar has been provided with a new and satisfactory volume. If not, then there will be impatience and uneasiness to have the lesson over, that the books may be examined and tasted.

4. Again, the teacher is interrupted by the secretary, who comes to ask who in the class is present and who absent; the statistics of the school being so important that everything must give way to this inquiry.

5. Another interruption comes in the form of newspapers to be distributed; *Wellsprings*, *Child at Home*, *Sunday School Times*, and *Youth's Companions*.

6. Some minutes will perhaps be taken for public addresses from the superintendent, or visitors, especially from strangers:—perhaps in application of the lesson, which is not uniform in the school; and perhaps in reading some commen-

tary, an exercise by no means edifying to the younger scholars, and of questionable utility at the best.

7. Music being very important, and a concert or anniversary near at hand, some time must be redeemed for musical practice, and this makes *seven things*, all of which take up time and break in upon the fundamental idea of Sabbath schools,—that a teacher be brought into the closest personal contact with a small group of scholars of the same general attainments.

This idea, we fear, is too generally crowded, where we have put it, down to the foot.

All these things are component parts in our popular idea of a Sabbath school. The school would be behind the age that did not sing and pray and read and give, and have its weekly supply of books and periodicals. A large part of the religious instruction of the young comes through these channels.

We have already alluded to the so-called devotional services. How often these fail to give instruction in true devotion! How seldom is any distinction made in respect to the hymns that are sung, whether they are for worship or not! Nay, how commonly is it the melody, and not the hymn, that determines the selection! so that men and women come and sing as if they were babes, and belittling music is passed off as devotion!

What instruction in religion is given by means of libraries and periodicals? Who compiles the library? Who chooses books for the scholars? Who presumes to exercise any control over them, or even to advise them what to read and what to avoid? The teacher has no authority; perhaps never thinks of exerting an influence. We are inclined to believe that generally the fact that a book is in a Sabbath school library is considered an endorsement of it as fit for Sunday reading, and that most pupils never question the propriety of reading what they receive from such a source. It may be Mayne Reid's exciting stories, or Timothy Titcomb's works, or Abbott's histories, or Trowbridge's moral fictions, or Peter Parley's works, or books more usually classified as novels; no matter; if it is a library book, *it is all right!* And what is taught in this way is part of our present system of Sabbath school instruction! Says Dr. J. W. Alexander, "We need not wonder that,

in no age since Christianity was promulged, have so many professing Christians held themselves aloof from sound and edifying books on religion. This repugnance to the very aliment in which our evangelical forefathers delighted—this disposition to consider truly religious writings as tedious and uninteresting, if not abhorrent to taste, has led to a perfectly new species of literature, the growth exclusively of modern society and of the modern church; in a word, to that which may be denominated *light religious reading*.” And then he adds, “With sadness and earnest apprehension, we say to those who counsel for the faith of the coming age, *Take heed what books your souls live on!* It is impossible to be too careful in the selection of religious reading for the family and the closet.”*

We come now to speak of the instruction given directly by teachers to their classes. It is not possible, of course, to estimate the proportion of those who, being themselves thoroughly furnished, fulfill their ministry by imparting knowledge in their classes. But we go into schools, and notice some teachers who have found the half hour which remains after all the other exercises have had their share, too long for their need; and they sit in silence, waiting for the closing signal, or converse on subjects foreign to the lesson, or permit their scholars to read the new library books. We find in other classes no instruction given, but a mere memoriter exercise. A teacher, with eight or ten scholars, begins at one end of the class to hear the hymn or the scripture which has been learned at home. Those at the other end of the bench, unable to hear the feeble tones of their classmates, read or play till their turn comes. The teacher goes the rounds, patiently hearing, helping, correcting, giving to each scholar a portion of time in due season; and by the time all have recited, the hour of instruction is over. This, in some schools, is *the* favorite way of spending the hour. It is a memoriter recitation of verses learned at home. We find another class in which the teacher is absent, and the place of teacher is taken by a scholar from

* The American Sunday School and its Adjuncts, 205, &c.

another bench, or by a stranger who has given no thought of preparation for the lesson.

We ask the superintendent what the school are studying, and find that one year, on the verse-a-day system, they are going through the book of Genesis, taking seven consecutive verses every Sabbath, and discarding question books as on the whole giving the teachers more trouble than profit. Another time they are in the profound mysteries of John's gospel, taking five consecutive verses, without regard to connection of thought or incident, and holding to the fiction of a common lesson for the school, when it proves on inquiry that hardly any two classes have exactly the same lesson. We ask if there is any study of a catechism? None. Perhaps the articles of faith of the church are studied? Never, unless the pastor has a special class of catechumens. Is there any plan by which pupils are carried along through a course of lessons, so that after a certain number of years a scholar will have gained some connected knowledge of the histories, the epistles, and the prophetic books? Oh no! scholars never enter the school expecting such a course of study as that. And is there anything like a normal class, in which teachers can have some special training for their work, and hints as to the best mode of winning souls? Nothing.

Enough has been said to show our dissatisfaction, and some of the grounds of dissatisfaction, with current methods of Sabbath school instruction. While free to say that we think the praise often bestowed upon our Sabbath school system is exaggerated, we should be grieved to have any word of ours quoted as a discouragement to teachers who are working in that system to the best of their knowledge and ability. But it is a serious question whether the energy and activity enlisted there cannot be more efficiently directed and employed than is done in the majority of our schools; and the question becomes vastly more important when it is proposed in any community to give up one of the stated appointments for worship and pulpit instruction, and substitute in place of it this many-sided exercise.

The expediency of such a change we do not discuss; but this

matter of instruction is of vital importance. What education is given to the present generation of youth? There is no religious instruction in public schools; very little in private schools; no study of Christian doctrine; no study of the history of Christianity; no thorough and systematic study of God's Word out of the Sabbath school, and next to none in it! Are we not training up a race of pigmies, instead of men and women conversant with religious truth and thoroughly furnished unto all good works?

We suggest, then, to pastors and laymen the need of making a great deal *less* or a great deal more of Sabbath schools,—*less*, not holding it up as a bounden duty that every one should come, and that Christian parents should send their children as a matter of course; or *more*, making them really schools, with a system of study, with graded classes, with fewer excrescences, and making them subordinate to the great ends of Christian nurture and education.

We venture also to offer some suggestions of possible improvements, which, in the present transition state of Sabbath schools, are worthy of consideration.

1. We would have every school that is connected with a church put under the acknowledged supervision of its pastor. The school cannot afford to be dis severed from his sympathy and thought, nor can he, whose commission requires him to feed the lambs as well as the sheep, afford to give up the instruction of the young to other hands. That he should be the acting superintendent, always present at his post, and charged with the entire responsibility for the management of the school, is not the essential thing. Other labors may forbid this; and he may find other men whose tact and attainments better fit them to direct the details of the classes and the methods of organization. But whatever customs may have prevailed, we think his place as pastor of the school should be recognized without hesitation on the part of the teachers, and without any scruples of delicacy on his own part. Let him, then, have his part in the instruction as a director of the association, who is to be consulted in respect to any important change, and who is responsible in his measure for the course of instruction that

is pursued, for the teachers that are employed, for the songs that are sung, and for the literature that is sent out weekly from the Sabbath school to the homes of the flock. We fear no conflict of jurisdiction between pastor and superintendent. We honor the lay brethren, who, standing by the school from year to year, have used their office well, and purchased to themselves a good degree; and we can understand how pastors often shrink from labors which others are willing and competent to assume. But we are persuaded, that to secure the warmest sympathies of the church for the Sabbath school, the shepherd of the flock must often be in the fold where the lambs are gathered.

And this theme is certainly one to which the attention of candidates for the ministry should be turned during their seminary course. In a course of lectures on the pastoral charge, the relation of the pastor to the Sabbath school, and the opportunities and methods of usefulness there, should by no means be passed by or slurred over.

2. We would insist most rigidly on the right of a teacher to have the exclusive attention of his pupils, during the full time allotted to class instruction. That time, whether longer or shorter, should be secure from interruption. No enumeration of scholars, no distribution of books, no collection of moneys, no conversation should divert the scholar's mind from the lesson which at that moment is of paramount importance. Then, if ever, the Scriptures are to be unfolded to the pupil's understanding; then the mind is to be impressed with solemn truths, and the heart attracted to Jesus; and every facility is to be furnished the teacher for getting access then and there to an immortal soul.

3. We approve most fully of an attempt to give each pupil a systematic education in the Sabbath school.

And to accomplish this it seems necessary to give up the plan, which has often worked so well, of having a uniform lesson for the whole school. There are some advantages in this uniformity, and no one can doubt that any topic, like the life of the "hero" Moses, may be so treated as to interest and instruct classes of very different ages and attainments. For

any one year all the scholars above the lowest grade might be studying together the Book of Genesis, or the Acts of the Apostles, or the Gospels. But if we are to look to the Sabbath school as furnishing the staple of religious instruction, if adults as well as children and youth are to be attracted thither and retained there for the weekly study of the Scriptures, is it not indispensable that there should be a systematic course of study? If something more is aimed at than the conversion of souls and their encouragement in holy living, if the Christian education of the whole congregation is attempted, must not the scholars be led "from strength to strength," in a well considered course of study extending over a period of years? And if there is an order of study which is better than another order, how can each group or class be educated in that order, without a thorough grading of the school? It may be very desirable that at some period of life the Epistle to the Romans should be carefully and consecutively studied, but we should not approve the plan of taking a whole school through it at once. Some of the scholars should be fed with milk until they are able to bear the meat. How shall we, then, provide for furnishing them meat when they are grown?

To arrange such a course of study, of course requires the wisdom which comes by experience; and, in general, the larger the school the more complete may the system be made. We only claim that some system is essential. And some such plan as this is worthy of attention. Let the youngest scholars, under the age of eight or ten years, form a separate department for diversified exercises of singing, recitation, and instruction. On their transfer from this juvenile department to the main school, let them commence the study of our Saviour's life, which, in one aspect and another, may occupy three years. Let them learn here not only incidents, but the connection of incidents, and connect his biography with the land in which he dwelt. After this, the Book of Genesis might occupy a year, and the remaining history of the Old Testament another year. The next year might be devoted to the early history of the church, and the life of Paul. Then, for two years, the time would be well spent on the Epistles to the

Romans and to the Hebrews. And the next year a selection from the Psalms might be studied in their historical, prophetic, and practical character. For the tenth year, we would have a review of the whole range of Bible history, and we would not consider such a course complete until another year had been devoted to the study of Christian doctrines. Such a dividing out of work implies of course that there is a large field of study beyond. Let there be, then, a post-graduate course, progressive, but variable as circumstances may demand.

The question-books of Mr. Knox, whose titles we have already given, are part of a series which aims to secure thoroughness and progress. The author's full plan includes a graduated course from the Lord's Prayer to the Evidences of Christianity. The three volumes that have been published are designed for those who have advanced beyond the *oral* instruction of the Infant Class. Two other volumes belong to this series, which is to be followed by topical lessons of the Bible Class. Each of the three contains an outline of the Saviour's life, but with a different series of incidents, and the idea of progressive instruction is admirably carried out. The maps and the illustrations are also attractive and helpful, and we cannot doubt that they will be favorite question books with both scholars and teachers.

And why should we not borrow from the experience of secular seminaries, and establish some sort of *normal schools* for those who desire to become "apt to teach" religious truth? The weekly lecture and the pastor's bible class may take this direction, but deficient as our general system of education is in this particular, there certainly seems to be room for some institution for equipping and training Sabbath school teachers for their work; and we are not sure but such an institution in a central place would be well sustained.

We foresee that this plan of a graduated series of lessons will encounter the objection that it involves too much difficulty in its execution. It is not certainly so simple as the plan of taking a verse a day and making the seven verses of the week the text for the Sabbath lesson; but we believe that the

Sabbath school, challenging the public to attend its exercises and appreciate its advantages, may gain a much stronger hold upon all who wish for instruction, and may retain many young men who think themselves too old to keep up their connection with a school for "children," by holding up to view, for years in advance, the work that is to be done. And we know no better time than the present for experiments in this direction, when attention is so generally directed to the Sabbath school, and so many congregations are asking for new methods of instruction to take the place, in part, of pulpit discourse.

ARTICLE VII.—GOVERNMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

POPULAR elections in the United States, and the discussions incident thereto, keep the public mind in a state of vigilant attention to the political issues of the day, and diffuse a general intelligence of which we justly boast. Among the many advantages of our system, we count it not the least, that it is educational. As a school, however, for acquiring true and just views of government, it has one very great defect. Nearly all our political discussions relate to some pending election, where the whole question practically turns on the success of a particular candidate for office. In this way, the true principle in issue becomes mixed up with so many extraneous influences, that it is in danger of being wholly lost sight of, or, at least, of being so perverted, as to lose the symmetry which properly belongs to it.

In Theology, we have a perfect standard which we hold up to men, whether they will hear or whether they will forbear. In the law we have an inflexible standard, which courts guard with jealous care from every extraneous influence. We separate the law from the fact and bring it to the test of a fixed and established standard. But the only standard in a popular election is the majority of votes. Personal prejudice against, and personal partiality for a candidate, largely influence the canvass. In the discussions which precede an election, no candidate is likely to come before the people with any unwelcome truth. He can hardly be expected to combat popular errors, or to breast the current of popular prejudice. The temptation to fall in with the current—to increase it—and to take advantage of it, is too strong for candidates to resist.

Now, if there be a science of government—if government has its true philosophy founded in immutable principles, are we not in danger of having these principles perverted by the loose philosophies manufactured in our popular elections? The statement of the simplest elementary truths,—as that

wherever there is government, there must be the governed—that government is the supreme human authority over the people, and that the people are under it—would fall too harshly on the ear, to be ever spoken by any candidate soliciting votes. All our forms of expression have been so framed, as to convey the idea, that in these free United States, the people are not under the government, but over it. The people rule. The people are sovereign. The will of the people is supreme. We call the government an agent, thereby implying that its powers may be revoked at pleasure and controlled during their continuance. We call the government a compact, thereby implying that it is only an agreement and not an authority. If ever we venture to call it a government, we are careful to qualify the expression by large reservations of sovereignty to the people. We have had the doctrine of popular sovereignty in many forms. We have had the great popular sovereignty of the people of the United States. We have had the lesser popular sovereignty of the people of the respective States or State sovereignty. We then had the popular sovereignty of the people of the territories; and, last of all, we had confederate popular sovereignty, or that the people within the limits of the attempted Southern confederacy were sovereign. And then came the contest between the government of the United States, the only true sovereignty known to the Constitution, and all these false forms of popular sovereignty. Then came the trial which was to test not only the strength of our political fabric, but the soundness of current political theories. The government established by the Constitution in immutable principles, acting on its right of self-preservation by force, and steadily refusing to abdicate its authority by concession or negotiation, asserted its supremacy over all the false sovereignties arrayed against it, and, at the end of the conflict, stood forth, not only victorious in arms, but stronger in the respect, confidence, and affection of the American people than it ever was before. During the war, we witnessed the singular spectacle of men in numberless instances volunteering to fight against the political theories for which they voted at the polls. It will be a still more singular spec-

tacle, if Southern rebels shall renounce the political theories for which they have always declared they were ready to die, and shall acquiesce in principles they have always professed to abhor. It is safe for us to act on the belief, that God has so made men that they will submit to a just government.

We call the government of the United States the best ever made. Our sacrifices in maintaining and preserving it have been costly. The past has its lessons for the people. They may learn that it is not safe to make government their plaything. They may learn that liberty without its just restraints becomes anarchy. They may learn that false doctrines long inculcated will in the end be acted on, and surely lead to disorder. There is, as it seems to us, no need in the future of our talking so much about liberty. The real danger to liberty is through popular license and insubordination. There is need of more talk about the paramount duty of obedience to government, and of less about popular sovereignty, and the popular will. Because this is the freest and best government in the world, we hold that for that very reason it ought to be the best obeyed.

Government is instituted among men to secure certain great ends. For this purpose it must have an artificial machinery. It is a machine. We call it a machine, and speak of its wheels and their revolutions. Like all machines, it must operate on its own principles of construction. We have seen that demonstrated. Our machine of government was constructed to move on the principles of justice and liberty! All the wit of man could not make it run on slavery. Like all machines, it must be so constructed as to restrain, regulate, and apply the motive power. A water wheel erected on a river, so as to revolve with the current, but having no provision for restraining the motive power of the river, and applying it to a proposed end, would not be a machine. So a political structure moved by the popular will, but having no provision for restraining and regulating the popular will, and applying it to a proposed end, would not be a government. In constructing machines, we first ascertain the laws which the Creator has imposed on matter, and conforming our work

to these laws, rely for success on their uniform operation. So in government, true statesmanship consists in ascertaining the laws which the Creator has imposed on man, and acting in conformity with them. If we violate these great laws, we can no more expect success in the one case than in the other.

It has been a favorite theory with political writers, that government is founded on compact. A compact binds those who make it, but nobody else. On what principle can a majority bind the minority by a compact or agreement? And how can one generation of men bind their posterity by a compact? The Declaration of Independence has been supposed to assert the doctrine of compact, when it declares that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." But who are the governed? All natural persons, men, women, and children, a large part of whom are incapable of any other than an implied or presumed consent. The Declaration of Independence says that all these "are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, and that to secure these rights governments are instituted." Here is an express declaration that men cannot alienate their own natural rights, much less the natural rights of others, by any compact. The consent spoken of is that implied consent which every person is justly presumed to give to a government so instituted as to secure to all their just rights.

It is a current American idea, that government is founded in the will of the people. This is one of the many loose phrases which have grown out of our popular elections. There is but one Being in the Universe whose will is law. Human will is no standard of right and no basis of authority. The very object, use, and necessity of government, is to restrain and regulate it.

We shall search in vain for any satisfactory philosophy of government which does not recognize the relations of man to his Maker. The Declaration of Independence begins with man as a created being, and asserts the rights with which he is endowed by his Creator. These natural rights imply natural obligations, for no one could enjoy his own rights, if others were not bound to respect them. Government is the enforce-

ment of natural obligations, and in this way the protection of natural rights. The moral restraints of reason, affection, and conscience not being adequate, human government comes in aid of them. Being a necessity, we find arrangements made by the Creator for its institution. We find, in the first place, the family relation, which is clearly established in nature. Mankind are created male and female, and about an equal number of each, with desires which bring them together as man and wife. There is given to them the strongest affections for their offspring, and the family is thus constituted with the husband and father as its natural guardian. In like manner, communities, consisting of a great number of families, have their guardians in nature clearly indicated as the proper persons to make and enforce rules necessary for the common protection and welfare of all. The husband naturally represents the wife; the father, his children; and competent persons, those who are incompetent. As communities grow and expand into nations, many artificial rights and obligations spring into existence, but the great principle remains unchanged.

Superficial readers have sometimes failed to find in the Constitution of the United States a recognition of man's relations to God, and in their haste have called it an atheistic instrument. To say nothing of the oath or solemn appeal to God which it requires of all its officers, executive, legislative, and judicial, let us look at that great opening declaration, in which the ends and principles of our government are set forth. "To form a more perfect union." Harmony and order—heaven's first law. "To establish justice." Justice, that great attribute of the Almighty. "To provide for the general welfare." He careth for all and his tender mercies are over all his works. "To secure the blessings of liberty." Religious liberty or the right to worship God according to conscience. Civil liberty or the enjoyment of the rights which God has given to every human being. These are the pillars of the temple which our fathers built for themselves and their posterity. In the name of these great and immutable principles; in the name of the people of whose rights and obligations these principles are the measure and the guaranty; in the

name not of those merely who acted in its formation, but of all the people, the Constitution was ordained and established. It is but a poor conception of the meaning of those celebrated words—"we, the people of the United States," to construe them merely as the majority of voters, by which the Constitution was ratified. This majority bore no comparison to that by which the imperial crown was placed on the head of the first Napoleon by the suffrages of the voters of France. Ours is a people's government, not because it was ratified by a majority of those who voted on its adoption, but because it is founded in the protection of the rights of the people.

The Declaration of Independence has sometimes been regarded as the commencement of a new era in government. But the seeds of civil liberty and just government were sown long before, and had already germinated into a vigorous growth. The great truths, that man was endowed by his Creator with an absolute and inalienable right to life, liberty, and the products of his labor, and that the true end of government was to protect and secure the rights which man thus received from his Maker, had been enunciated long before, and with more precision than they are stated by Mr. Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. Many of our principles of civil liberty are as old as Magna Charta, and every one of them is of English origin. They grew up during the long struggle between the arbitrary power of the Crown and that sturdy Saxon spirit, which steadily maintained civil liberty against the king, the aristocracy, and an unfriendly social system. They were transplanted here by men who came to what was then the new world, that they might enjoy the rights which God had given them, and here in a virgin soil, where no unfriendly institutions or traditions of the past had taken root, constitutional liberty, for the first time, had a fair chance for a full and complete development.

In the British constitution, the security of civil liberty rests entirely on what is called the balance of power. The supreme authority or sovereignty is in Parliament, which is composed of three constituent parts, the King, the Lords, and the House of Commons. All these three constituent parts must concur

in every Act of Parliament. When they thus concur, there is no other power in the Realm that can question or resist the Act or Order. So complete is the omnipotence of Parliament, that Lord Coke says, Parliament can do anything but make a man a woman. Lord Coke in this fell a little short of the true English law; for if Parliament should declare a man to be a woman, every Court in the kingdom must hold that he is a woman. The only security is in the check which each constituent part of Parliament has on the other parts, and in the extreme improbability, or, as the English writers say, moral impossibility, that all the three parts will ever combine to subvert the liberties of the people. This is the boasted balance of the British constitution; and while it may furnish sufficient security against oppressive legislation, it makes no adequate provision for getting rid of old abuses which have already become incorporated in their system. The King holds by hereditary right. He is not accountable for his acts. He cannot be impeached, for the fundamental maxim is—the King can do no wrong. The Lords hold by hereditary right, and act on their personal honor as peers of the Realm, but without accountability. Both the King and Lords, by the natural instinct of preserving their own prerogatives, will be likely to resist innovations in the laws, even where the changes and progress of the world have made such innovations just and beneficial.

- The Constitution of the United States supplies the defects in that of England in two ways. 1. By making more divisions of power, and in this way providing more checks against its abuse. 2. By subjecting all who are entrusted with power to a rigid accountability.

The most striking feature in our government is the division of powers into State and National. When slavery and its attendant heresy of State sovereignty shall disappear, no longer to disturb the harmonious workings of this double machinery, so that each part shall move in its proper sphere without hindrance or obstruction, the wisdom of this admirable arrangement will be universally seen and admitted.

We shall best comprehend the relations of the State and Na-

tional governments by looking to the history of their formation, and seeing how they came into existence. At the time of the Declaration of Independence, the American Colonies were mere dependencies of the British crown. They were not a constituent part of the English realm, but the king claimed and exercised the right to suspend or abrogate at pleasure the laws of the colonial legislatures, and to subject the Colonies to the laws of Parliament, in which they had no voice or representation. This was the precise issue between the Colonies and the king. The Colonies did not, like our Southern rebels, claim to overthrow a government of which they were a constituent part, and in which they had even more than an equal representation ; but they claimed that taxation and representation ought to go together, and that they ought to be placed on the same footing as British subjects. The abettors of anarchy and wild revolution can find nothing in the teaching or example of our fathers to justify their mad schemes. The United Colonies became, by the Declaration of Independence, United States, and, by an instinct of nationality, drew closer together to meet the impending contest. The articles of confederation were the incipient and imperfect construction which they had time and opportunity to make during the perils and perplexities of a great war, which taxed their energies to the utmost. On the termination of the struggle, the first idea which possessed the minds of men, was to finish what was only begun, and to perfect a government for the great nation foreseen in the future. The whole period from the Declaration of Independence to the final adoption of the Constitution, may properly be regarded as one forming period, or period of gestation preceding the birth of a nation. The government of the United States, thus gradually formed, is one with a double machinery. At the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the States had already perfected their separate organizations, and all that remained was to arrange them in their appropriate spheres, so as to revolve in harmony around a common centre. The great architects who were called to the work of construction, were not ignorant of the necessity of a supreme regulating power, without which, on the first collision, the machine

would stop, and their work be an utter failure. Four plans, and only four, were submitted to the convention—one by Edmund Randolph of Virginia, one by Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, one by Alexander Hamilton of New York, and one by Mr. Patterson of New Jersey. The plan submitted by Gov. Randolph contained the following provision: "That the national legislature ought to be empowered to negative all laws passed by the several States contravening, in the opinion of the national legislature, the articles of union, and to call forth the force of the Union against any member of the Union failing to fulfill its duties under the articles thereof." The plan submitted by Charles Pickney, had a provision in these words: "The Legislature of the United States shall have the power to revise the laws of the several states that may be supposed to infringe the powers exclusively delegated by this Convention to Congress, and to negative such as do." Alexander Hamilton's plan had the following provision: "All laws of the particular states contrary to the Constitution or the laws of the United States to be utterly void. And the better to prevent such laws being passed, the governor or the president of each state, shall be appointed by the general government and shall have a negative upon the laws about to be passed in the state of which he is governor or president." The plan of Mr. Patterson was one for correcting, revising, and enlarging the Articles of Confederation, and it provided "that all acts of the United States in Congress assembled, made by virtue and in pursuance of the powers hereby vested in them, and by the Articles of Confederation, shall be the supreme law of the respective States; and if any state, or any body of men in any state, shall oppose or prevent the carrying into execution such acts, the federal executive shall be authorized to call forth the powers of the Confederate States, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to enforce and compel an obedience to such acts." We thus see that the necessity of a supreme authority with power to enforce obedience was clearly comprehended, and was asserted in every plan submitted to the Convention. Instead, however, of giving, as was first proposed, an express power to the national government to negative any state law, and coerce any

state by force of arms, which seemed to the Convention an unnecessarily harsh provision, there was substituted that emphatic declaration "that the Constitution and the laws of the United States made in pursuance thereof, shall be the supreme law of the land." Not "the supreme law of the respective States," as provided in the plan of Mr. Patterson, already referred to, but "the supreme law of the land." The Constitution and the laws of Congress are thus made national and paramount, and all cases arising under either are in express terms subjected to the judicial power of the National Government. The States are assigned their spheres of exclusive local legislation, and no considerate person would wish to see them disturbed in these. But by an irreversible law, there can be but one sovereignty in the same nation. The States cannot appear among the sovereigns of the world. They cannot exercise any of the powers denominated sovereign. They are subordinated to the National Government and made amenable to its judicial power. By the Constitution as originally made, any citizen of the United States might sue a state before the Courts of the United States—a provision very significant of the subordinated position of the States. It is not necessary to discuss at greater length the doctrine of state sovereignty. The events of the last four years have, as we hope, forever rid the country of this dangerous heresy. In the future, the state governments will be regarded with just favor, as an admirable contrivance for bringing local legislation in close sympathy with the wants of the people, and as furnishing a great and salutary check on the abuse of power.

The powers of the national government are divided into three coördinate branches, the legislative, executive, and judicial. The legislative power is vested in Congress, consisting of the Senate, composed of two senators from each state, chosen by the legislatures thereof, and the House of Representatives chosen by the electors in each state. These two bodies, by the different modes of their election, form a check on each other. The Senate is a check on the popular majority, and is also the especial guardian of the rights of the States. The executive power is vested in the president, chosen by electors appointed

by the several States, and each state has as many electors as the number of senators and representatives to which it is entitled in the Congress, under which provision it might easily happen that a candidate, who in fact received a majority in the popular vote, would not have a majority of the presidential electors: This is an intentional check upon the popular majority. Every law, order, or resolution, proposed by Congress must be approved by the President, or in case of his disapproval can be re-passed only by two-thirds of each branch. Thus we see, that while the Senate and House of Representatives are a check on each other, the veto of the President is a check upon both. The judicial power is vested in the Courts of the United States, whose judges hold their offices for life, subject only to impeachment, and their compensation cannot be diminished during their continuance in office. The judicial power thus made independent and carefully guarded from every undue influence was designed to be a bulwark to withstand the currents of popular excitement on the one hand, and the encroachments of the executive and legislative powers on the other. It is worthy of notice how the terms of office are arranged to hold in check the popular majority. The House of Representatives is elected for two years. The President for four years. The Senate for six years. The judges of the Supreme Court for life. At no one time can the majority of votes ever act on all the branches of the government. Behind all these checks, and guards, and barriers, so carefully constructed for its protection, our Fathers deposited the treasure of civil liberty.

But the powers conferred upon the government of the United States, though guarded with such jealous caution, are ample for every emergency. The terms are concise and for that reason, comprehensive. "The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes." "To borrow money on the credit of the United States." "To regulate commerce." "To coin money," and "regulate the value thereof." "To establish post offices and post roads." "To declare war." "To raise and support armies." "To provide and maintain a navy." "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into

execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested in the government of the United States." We quote these provisions of the Constitution to show in what general and comprehensive terms the great powers of Congress are granted. And so of the powers granted to the President. "He is to take care that the laws be faithfully executed." That solemn oath so definitely framed and prescribed, "to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution," arms him with power to meet every emergency. The government of the United States has, it is true, its limitations, its prohibitions, its duties imposed, and its principles of action defined, but these do not take away its sovereignty. The sovereign of the universe has His principles of action, from which He will not, and we may without irreverence say, cannot depart.

We have already seen, that the elements of representative government are to be found in nature. As in the family the husband and father is the natural guardian and representative, so in society there are natural guardians and representatives clearly indicated as the proper persons to form a government and to be the primary representatives of the people in its administration. Our political system is founded on this arrangement in nature. The primary representatives in nature of the rights and welfare of the people, are made electors, or voters. We are in the habit of denominating these electors who vote as "the people." But four fifths of the people having equal civil rights and therefore citizens, are not voters. The elective franchise is political power, and those entrusted with it are trustees and representatives. They are admitted on qualification. They take an oath to support the Constitution and to vote for the general welfare. Bribery and other undue influence are punished. They are not permitted to vote on measures of government, but only to elect those who may. In the election of the President they are only primary electors to vote for the secondary electors, which last are to choose the President. The nomination of a presidential candidate is properly only a recommendation, though it has gradually come to be imperative, and in this respect has practically changed the Constitution. The tendency has been to give to the

majority of votes a greater effect than was originally designed. The object of the Constitution in making offices elective was to subject them to accountability, and bring them in contact and sympathy with the wants of the people. It was not intended that the majority of voters should dictate the measures of government. All officers when elected are bound by oath to act in obedience to the Constitution and their own convictions of duty.

A great deal has been said and written about the reserved sovereignty of the people,—a phrase conveying, as it seems to us, very loose and dangerous ideas of government. The tenth article of the amendment to the Constitution has been much relied on to support this doctrine of reserved sovereignty. It declares that “the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively or to the people.” If this amendment is to be construed to be a reservation of sovereignty, then there is one sovereignty reserved to the States, and another sovereignty to the people; or if but one sovereignty is reserved, it is either in the States or in the people, and nobody can tell in which. The amendment has in this way so puzzled the political theorists, that some have declared it to be a vague generality, meaning nothing in particular. In common sense, this tenth article has a plain and obvious meaning. It is a limitation of the powers of the national government to the uses for which they were granted and a prohibition of their being perverted to the infraction of the just rights of the States or of the civil liberty of the people. It is one of a large number of amendments which were passed to meet the attacks made on the Constitution, and quiet the fears created by these attacks, that the government of the United States would absorb all power, and becoming a consolidated despotism would overthrow the State organizations, and subvert the liberties of the people. These amendments were intended to furnish a rule of construction, being specific declarations that power should not be assumed nor enlarged by any construction to take away the rights of the States or the rights of the people. The tenth article is of the same general import as the other

amendments, which declare "the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances," "the right of the people to keep and bear arms," "the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects," "the enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny, or disparage others retained by the people." These are all manifestly limitations of power in favor of civil liberty, not reservations of sovereignty. The government of the United States is one of limitations, prohibitions, and duties imposed, for the observance of which the Constitution has provided every possible security. But any doctrine suggesting remedies outside of its provisions is dangerous and revolutionary.

The Constitution was made to be perpetual. It was ordained and established by its makers for themselves and their posterity. It is founded in immutable principles. There is no reserved power in states, or people, to abrogate it, or any of its fundamental provisions. It is true that it provides for amendments, so that a fault in its artificial workings may be corrected, or an obstruction like that of slavery may be removed. But even amendments are allowed in the most guarded form. They can be proposed only in two ways. 1. By two-thirds of both Houses of Congress. 2. On the application of the legislatures of two thirds of the States, it is made the duty of Congress to call a convention for proposing amendments. The power of calling the convention is vested in Congress, which carries with it the power of deciding whether the application is in due form. Amendments proposed in either mode must be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by Congress, and there is added the significant words that when so ratified they "shall be valid to all intents and purposes *as part of this Constitution.*" It would be a perversion of the meaning of these words, as well as the meaning of the word "amendment," to construe them so as to give a power to abrogate the Constitution or any of its fundamental parts.

In government, as in all things else, we look to the Supreme

Being to find the standard of perfection. He has infinite goodness to choose the best ends, infinite wisdom to choose the best means, and infinite power to carry these means into execution. But His immutability is what gives security to the Universe. While in humble imitation of the Divine Original, we seek to give to human government the attributes of goodness, wisdom, and power, we shall fail, if we do not also imitate the immutability which crowns all the other attributes of God.

We conclude by quoting from the first Inaugural of Abraham Lincoln, whose words spoken for liberty and the Constitution are now forever consecrated: "I hold that in the contemplation of universal law and of the Constitution, the union of these States is perpetual. Perpetuity is implied, if not expressed, in the fundamental law of all national governments. It is safe to assert, that no government proper ever had a provision in its organic law for its own termination. Continue to execute all the express provisions of our national constitution, and the Union will endure for ever, it being impossible to destroy it, except by some action not provided for in the instrument itself."

ARTICLE VIII—SHEOL; HADES; THE INVISIBLE STATE.

THE place of the dead is distinguished from this world, in the language of the ancient Hebrews, as an invisible state, into which all men enter at death. All at death enter it, as their common residence, whether they are good or evil, the just or unjust, because at death the body is the tenant of the grave and corruption, and passes from the sight of men, and the soul, being a disembodied spirit, is not visible to mortal eyes. This fact of passing from our sight in this world is common in regard to all men at death. They go into Hades—the invisible world.

But this fact of their being absent from our sight indicates nothing about their particular place of residence or their condition. If they are in Heaven, they are in Hades—a world invisible to us. If they are in Hell, *γέεννα*, they are still in Hades, a world invisible to us. The opinion of the Jews represented Hades as both the *grave of the body in the ground*, and the *abode of spirits* under the ground, in deep subterranean regions, as in the proverb against the king of Babylon. Isaiah, xiv. 9–20.* These were popular opinions among the Jews, the Greeks, and the Romans. Hence the universe of creatures is classed in Phil., ii. 10 as *ἐπουρανίων*, supernatural or Heavenly, *ἐσθγιών*, terrestrial, and *καταχθονίων*, subterranean.

Now as death places all men in Hades, they remain in that state of *invisibility* to mortals, until they become visible by resurrection from the dead. Hence, to summon them back,

* "Hell (Hades) from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming: it stirreth up the dead for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth: it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. All they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become as weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave, and the noise of thy viols: the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee." * * * * *

the revelation of Christ asserts, that at the close of this system of redemption, when he shall come to assign the whole race, in full presence of the universe, their eternal awards, his voice shall call the dead from their graves; the dead beneath the ground shall hear his voice, and come forth to the resurrection. This is a figurative description of the power of his will. Not that literally there are any words used by Christ, or heard by the departed spirits; but, as when he said to dead Lazarus, "Come forth!" his soul was brought into living union with his still organized body, so his power reaches the souls, and re-organizes around them new spiritual bodies.

But do resurrection and the judgment follow immediately on the death of each individual, and are the resurrection and judgment of all mankind accomplished as the result of this progressive work on all the race, except that portion that remain alive on the earth at the close of Christ's earthly Kingdom? If so, there is no intermediate state between death and the judgment to individual souls; but all are on probation here, or in Heaven or Hell as their eternal state.

As to the question of *time*. The *time* is defined by the limits between death and resurrection,—the time of invisibility. Thus Christ was in Hades, when his spirit was out of the body, and out of Hades, when his spirit returned to quicken and inhabit the body. Where his soul literally was in that interval, whether in any congregation of the lost, or in any company of the saved, or roving in solitariness, awaiting his return to his still organized body, does not appear from the fact that it was in Hades, and would not be left there by the Father, who would show him the path of life.

As to the question of *place*. Where is Hades? The popular idea was that the soul at death descends into subterranean regions and remains in them as shades, either in Elysium or in Orcus, as the Romans and Greeks believed, or in gardens of paradise, or in regions of flame and burning. Now as this was the popular idea, the popular language was employed in revelation, of souls *descending* at death into Hades and *coming up* at their return to earth and the body by resurrection. The origin of this idea of locality is probably from the

impression that the soul, when the material body perishes in the earth, hovers around the place of its companion. Hence they supposed that the shades of those that perished in the sea hovered around in the waters, and that consequently, at the resurrection, when the sea gave up her dead, these spirits entered their quickened bodies and rose out of the sea, as the spirits under the land sought their quickened bodies in the graves of earth and came forth. But this popular belief and impression is used in revelation to denote the fact of a resurrection that is to take place. It does not intend to explain the *mode*; it simply asserts the great practical *fact*. Just as Scripture asserts that the sun stood still on Gibeon, not to assert the mode of continuing his light by stopping its motion, but the fact of miraculous departure from the course of nature in the continuance of his light at the word of Joshua. So in every passage in Scripture which speaks of the sun as performing his circuit in the heavens, as rising and setting, we have the fact asserted merely of apparent phenomena, not a philosophic account of the sun's motions. The *descent* of souls to Hades and their *coming up* to earth, then, when the language is used in Scripture, cannot be alleged as a revelation of the fact of a literal descent, or ascent. Hades, therefore, the invisible residence of departed spirits, is not proved in any such description to be literally in the ground or sea. It may be in whatever place a disembodied spirit may be. It is as possible that they should be invisible around us, as in any other place, from the mere description of an invisible state. But if we look at particular cases spoken of in the Scriptures, it seems impossible to reconcile them with any notion of a literal underground location.

Thus Moses and Elijah were with the Saviour on the Mount, and became visible to the Apostles present. They were not under the earth. And though Elijah had never entered Hades because he had not died, yet Moses, it must be acknowledged, had, and had not yet reached the period of release by the resurrection. He at least was a spirit, coming out of Hades at the time, not by any ascent from subterranean regions, but by a miraculous clothing of light, which might be granted him there, whether he came up there from the subterranean re-

gions, or came down to comfort the Saviour from the assembled spirits of the just made perfect, already at that day gathered in heaven. Again, of this assembly at least, we may say that so far as locality is concerned at all, they were not in any fancied region under ground, they were in the Heavenly Jerusalem, on Mount Zion above, in the presence of the innumerable company of angels, and before the Judge of all. At least if that assembly has any locality, it is not underground, but looked to by faith as above the heavens. So, too, Stephen, when about to be stoned, looked up into heaven, as opened to him by vision, and saw Jesus the ascended, and as he expired, he said, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." Acts vii. 59. Did Christ take that spirit and admit it into the glorious place seen of him in vision, or did he send it off and down into the lower parts of the earth? So Paul longed, by leaving the body, to be present with his ascended and glorified Saviour. Did he suppose that at death his soul would go down into the subterranean regions, away from the glorious vision of Christ, left with the bare conviction of the omnipresence of the Saviour, which accompanied him while in the body, and that he was still to be absent from the glorious vision for the ages to intervene until the general resurrection? Where, then, was his gain?

Our next question is, as to *the condition of souls in Hades*.

Are they, as some suppose, in an unconscious state of torpor and inaction until the final resurrection? Paul asserts in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, that believers in Christ who had died had fallen asleep, and were to sleep till the day of resurrection. But such language is taken from the bodily resemblance of sleep and death, and the peaceful state of Christian souls as resting in joy with Christ. There are passages of the Old Testament, which speak of this state as a deprivation of all present privilege, action, and feeling, such as Hezekiah's prayer, Isaiah xxxviii. 18,* and as Psalms xxx. 9,† cxv. 17,‡ and

* "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee; they that go down to the pit cannot hope for thy truth."

† "What profit is there in my blood, when I go down to the pit? Shall the dust praise thee? Shall it declare thy truth?"

‡ "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence."

Ecclesiastes ix. 4-6.* Now of these passages of the Old Testament, it cannot be said that they reveal anything of the real condition of the dead, other than a mere negation of the opportunities and privileges which pertain to our present existence. Revelation did not then disclose the positive condition of souls after death. This was to be effected by Christ in his personal experience and teaching, taking off the veil cast over eternity, and bringing life and immortality into the light. These passages merely urged a practical attention to the duties and privileges of this life, while they continued: that, if neglected here, they were gone forever. But this denial of the continuance of our present privileges beyond death, leaves the positive condition of a future state, as one remaining for a more clear and a positive revelation to disclose. It only urges men to do the practical duties of this life, while life lasts, as they have no opportunity to do them afterwards. If anything remains after, it is only the consequences. These passages, then, in denying the continuance of present privileges beyond death, do not positively deny any future life whatever, nor positively assert a future existence in torpor.

Again, Paul in his First Epistle to the Thessalonians, iv. 13, speaks of those who have died as believers in Christ, that they are asleep, and that believers who live on the earth at the time of Christ's future coming, will not prevent those that have fallen asleep. For the sleeping dead will God bring with Christ, when he comes. Christ, it is said, will descend, and, first raising the sleeping dead, will change living Christians for immortality, and take both up with him into the air or sky. Now this sleep is descriptive of peace and hope in Christ, that their death is not death as pain or privation, much less that their souls are deprived of the presence of Christ; for into their very state the Apostle himself wished to depart for the higher enjoyment of Christ. It is a euphemism, to de-

* "The dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten. Also their love and their hatred and their envy, is now perished: neither have they any more a portion forever in any thing that is done under the sun."

scribe a peaceful death of the body, veiling under it the unknown joys of another life. Besides, when Christ comes down, he brings the souls of them that have fallen asleep with him. Are not those souls brought down to be clothed with their bodies made anew and glorious in resurrection ?

But if these passages do not prove a state of insensibility after death, there are multitudes of others which speak of the dead as living in a state of happiness or suffering immediately after death, as we now see under the inquiries that remain.

If, then, souls after death are in a state of conscious life, our next question is, do they pass the judgment seat and enter on their state of rewards immediately after death ?

Now that all are in an invisible state, i. e., in Hades unto that last day, nothing is revealed. The idea is merely a popular one, the common apprehension of mankind, that the dead are in Hades. But that term is negative, it reveals nothing of their positive condition. It is only relative to us they are *out of sight*, a *negative* term, implying that we do not see or know them by our senses. We infer nothing more than from the popular language and apprehension of sight, as when we say the sun *rises* and *sets*.

Now of souls in Hades, the ignorance of man before Christ came, is set forth in such language as the following : Hezekiah, in celebrating the love that saved him from death, said (Isaiah xxxviii. 18), "For the grave cannot praise thee, death cannot celebrate thee ; they that go down into the pit cannot hope for thy truth."

Here it is all negative as to the continuance of things in their present state, nothing positive of any other state. This looks as if light and immortality were not brought into the light of this world before the appearance of Christ on the earth.

But now, taking the revelation of Christ in our hands, let us go beyond the term "Hades" and inquire whether Christ has taught us anything of the present state of the dead. What he teaches us is, that the character is fixed unchangeably at death, that every soul is to appear at his judgment seat and give account of itself to him, that each is to be judged accord-

ing to its deeds done in the body ; that after death cometh the judgment ; and after the judgment cometh the recompense.

Now as to the question whether the resurrection, judgment, and sentence of each individual takes place at death, or whether it is deferred for centuries till the last day of this earth ; or whether it takes place in part at death, and more completely at the close of the world ; respecting these three opinions the following things are to be taken into consideration :

And first, as to the facts which seem to favor the *immediate result at death*, without any intermediate state of delay and waiting ; i. e. that the wicked are immediately condemned and cast into their place of punishment, and the righteous immediately accepted and admitted into glory.

I. Christ teaches that Lazarus immediately at death was admitted to the society of Abraham in heavenly joys ; that the rich man entered immediately on the ever-enduring torments of an outcast from the kingdom of God. Would this be true without their entering upon their awards ? And would they enter upon their awards ages before their case was brought to judgment, while they were merely awaiting the day of trial ? Or, is it enough to say that they were in the *invisible* world when Christ brings them out of that invisible world to the vision of our faith as having entered on their unchangeable, and eternal state ?

II. Christ teaches us that Abraham and the patriarchs had already arisen from death and entered on an eternal life with God, in the days of Moses, when he quotes to the Pharisees as proof of a resurrection from death, the declaration of God to Moses, "I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob," that these patriarchs, ever since their death, though in an invisible state to mortals, were living still with God, and unto God. Is it merely that they were stored away in the memory of God, to be called up into conscious, happy existence, ages hence ?

III. Christ teaches that men are to be judged and awarded on the simple basis of deeds done by them in this life. If, then, the accounts on which they are to be judged are closed up to the judgment and fully made out, what shall we say of

their conduct during the ages that intervene between their death and the final day of the world? Are they, in this long interval, *insensible*, without capability of moral action and responsibility; or, if active and responsible, how can their account be justly confined to this life in the body?

IV. Moses and Elias are cases of the dead who left Hades certainly before the resurrection at the last day.

V. The thief on the cross. The souls of Christ and the thief were in Hades. Christ came out of it, because he took his organized body up again in view of mortals; but the thief remained there as a disembodied spirit, remembered when Christ ascended into his kingdom. He was there, to welcome the glorified Redeemer.

So Paul was caught up to the third heaven, *εἰς τρίτου οὐρανοῦ, ἡπαύρ, εἰς τὸν παραδείσον.* 2 Corinthians xii. 2-4. Here paradise is reached as far off as the third heaven, and is a place of unutterable glory and fellowship with the Lord.

So the promise to him that overcometh in the Apocalypse, ii. 7. Here the paradise of God is a place of enjoyment and fellowship with God.

VI. The declaration of Paul, "while we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord," while we are absent from the body, we are present with the Lord. Now, if by death he was not to enter heaven, but into a state of waiting and expectation still, as here on earth, why should he describe the state as the enjoyment of the loving presence of Christ? The mere omnipresence, which cannot be escaped by going up to heaven, down to Hades, or into the remotest parts of the earth, this essential presence of Christ, how could he enter into it by leaving the body? He expected then to go to the heavenly presence and fellowship of the Saviour. He esteemed it far better to be absent from the body and present with the Lord.

So much favors the conclusion, that immediately after death is the judgment—the decision of the eternal state of the soul and its entrance on its eternal awards.

But again the doctrine of a resurrection and judgment of the whole race at the close of the reign of Christ over the world

as Messiah, seems clearly established by the following considerations.

1. The direct mention of the resurrection of all the dead, to take place at the end of the world,—at the final appearing of Christ.

2. The description of a general gathering to a public *judgment* and sentence of *destiny*.

3. The resurrection of Christ as the first fruits and afterwards the resurrection of his followers at his final coming.

If then souls are raised and judged at death, and if the dead are raised and judged at the coming of Christ, what must we conclude but that the secret judgment and award, which takes place at death on individuals, is made public and confirmed before the universe, to set forth the justice of God in his dealings with the whole race in their successive existence from Adam to the last of his posterity.

This consummation is called the day of the *revelation* of the righteous judgment of God.

This is the full *manifestation* of the sons of God, set forth in the promises of redemption.

This takes all out of Hades, by their entrance as spirits into visible bodies, to be reorganized and known of all.

This is the consummation of joy to believers and glory to their Redeemer, in collecting them visibly in the finished society of Heaven.

This, though a state of progress looked for with terror as the consummation of punishment, or with joy as the consummation of blessedness, is not inconsistent with the fact of the great decision of states of punishment and reward, entered upon at death. It is only appointing a day of public appearance of all to the recognition of each other in the new bodies of resurrection.

Hence the *anastasis*, the standing up of the *soul* after death, takes place at once when death occurs to the individual, and the *anastasis* ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, by union of the living soul to a new and spiritual body, takes place at the close of the world when Christ shall come and bring with him those that have fallen asleep in him—raising the dead, first changing the bod-

ies of his saints then alive, and taking the collected body up with him to Heaven.

The question then arises upon these facts, whether there is in reality any *intermediate state* in the existence of the soul?

There is no state intermediate between probation in time, and the awards of eternity. For every soul no sooner leaves one state than it enters upon the other.

There is no state intermediate between temporal death and the resurrection of the soul into its future life. As Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, after leaving this life, entered on the service of God in the invisible world.

Is there an intermediate state between the death of the body and the resurrection of the body? The resurrection of the body in a literal sense could occur only in those cases in which the organized body remained after death till the soul was called by divine power to re-enter it, and reanimate it, as in the case of Dorcas, Lazarus, the Saviour, and of many who at the Saviour's resurrection reappeared again out of their tombs to the recognition of friends in Jerusalem.

But the resurrection of the body spoken of at I. Cor. xv. is not the reanimation of the organized body that was laid down in the grave, but rather the gift to the soul of a far different body like that of the glorified Jesus, not of flesh and blood as before, but fashioned gloriously, such as Christians who remain alive at the coming of Christ will receive by miraculous change. Hence it is not so obvious as might at first appear, that these spiritual bodies of the saints are not given to them at death, and that the universal resurrection may not be accomplished merely by the summoning of all, at the appearing of Christ, into his presence and the presence of the universe, on that last Great Day when he will surrender his mediatorial kingdom and its fruits unto the Father and show his triumphs over all his enemies, yea, over death itself, the work of his Arch-Enemy, Satan.

ARTICLE IX.—THE LATE PRESIDENT WAYLAND.

PERSONAL power is something which it is often difficult to analyze. Hence it is called *magnetism*, being thus likened to an unknown, but powerfully acting force that baffles every attempt to lay hold of it and weigh it. This, at least, may be said, that such personal power does not reside in intellect alone. Men of brilliant and versatile talents often lack this peculiar impressiveness. They may, in some cases, even excite a degree of contempt among those who are brought into intercourse with them, because a certain deeper, more subtle power is missing. It is true that the exercise of the kind of sway to which we allude, requires talents above the level of mediocrity; although it should be observed that the very harmony and symmetry of superior powers, where nothing is found in excess, may be taken for mediocrity by a superficial eye,—as in the estimate, made by shallow critics, of Washington. But personal power results from a certain blending of mind and character. Intellectual and moral energy appear to mix in one current. Without doubt, *physical* superiority, where it is found, sets off this power and gives it an advantage. But that is not essential. Hildebrand, Frederic the Second of Prussia, Napoleon—we mention the examples that first occur—were men whose “bodily presence,” if not contemptible, was far from being imposing. They, and many like them, were persons of diminutive stature. An impressive exterior, if the mental part fails to correspond, renders the inward littleness of a man the more conspicuous. An expectation is raised, only to be disappointed. In humanity, as in architecture, mere *bigness* has not much honor. A man of this sort always seems to be in the way. It is clear that the impression of personal power is attended with the feeling that much is held in reserve. Back of words, back of explicit thoughts, there is a well which has not yet been sounded. It is remarkable that some rather silent persons are still pleasant companions. In reviewing

your intercourse with them, you do not recall much that they have said. Yet they somehow *appear* to be talking, and you feel yourself in converse with minds of no common order. How true is it that there is far more in a great soul than is coined into distinct expression! Where the forces of a human being are, to a large extent, collected in the character, this impression of reserved power, of a store of unexpended energies, is continually felt. Perhaps he is not doing much now, but wait for the emergency! One, in whose thoughts the highest interests of mankind are habitually uppermost, takes on a serious and lofty type of feeling, which surrounds him like an atmosphere, and without any effort on his side—partly because no effort is made to this end—moves respect.

The reader may think that we are wandering from the subject. But Dr. Wayland was one of this class of men, whose personal power much exceeded what a mere catalogue of his qualities would indicate. He was unquestionably an able man intellectually. Yet he was not a subtle metaphysician. He had no great relish for the nice distinctions in which the metaphysician takes delight, and which are vital in his science. Nor was he, though generally a sound logician, specially wary in a logical conflict, as was evinced in his controversy with a defender of slavery, Dr. Fuller, who profited by an occasional slip of his stronger adversary. Nor was Dr. Wayland an orator,—certainly not in the recognized and conventional use of the term. His intonations and gestures were conformed to no accepted standard, nor would they be considered pleasing. No more was he, properly speaking, a scholar. He did not aim to acquaint himself fully with the literature of any branch of knowledge. His reading was decidedly less extensive than is usual with persons of his ability and standing. Yet, for all this, Dr. Wayland was a great man. So every one felt who knew him. No one could be in the room with him and not be struck with his superiority. With no affectation of dignity, but with manners perfectly simple and even familiar, he commanded respect wherever he was. In the class-room, although he allowed full freedom and was quite willing to have his opinions controverted, he yet cast a spell over the minds of

his pupils from which it was hard to break loose. As a citizen of the community, he was in the highest degree influential, though he did not seek influence. What was the secret of all this acknowledged power? We think that one principal source of Dr. Wayland's personal power, was the fact that his mind seemed to be (and was) *in more direct contact with truth* than is the case with the minds of most men. He appeared to be seeking for nothing else. Nothing seemed to intervene between his mind and the truth, to warp his vision or bias his judgment. He certainly had little respect for authority. Perhaps he had too little; but he was saved from being cramped by an influence which has often enslaved the human intelligence. The usual forms in which Christian doctrine is stated, he thought open to criticism. He agreed substantially in his theology with the great body of Christians, but the *formulas* of theology had no sacredness in his eyes. He disdained a yoke of every sort, especially that of subservience to party. One of the chief lessons that he sought to inculcate, was the obligation to break away from any party the moment it required wrong-doing. Individual rights, individual responsibility and liberty, he exalted, in contrast with deference to antiquity, church authority, political party, or public opinion. Another fountain of his power was the depth of his convictions. His mind was less fertile than that of many, but it took a strong and sure hold of the most important truth. He had beliefs that were deeply rooted in his being. He had, also, a simple, profound, reverential love of right. The great, the supreme thing, in his eyes, was righteousness. He left on his pupils the impression that everything else was of minor consequence, compared with *doing right*. And to do right, especially when there was strong temptation to an opposite course, he felt to be a sublime thing. Examples of fidelity to duty under trying circumstances, thrilled his soul. Dr. Wayland had a strong will. This was an important foundation of his personal power. It was evident that he could be a man of action, and that if he chose to rouse himself, obstacles would be swept from his path. In ordinary intercourse, it was a strong will in repose, carrying with it an im-

pression of weight and force. He liked men of will. He was never tired of citing Napoleon's pithy sayings, and of referring to his efficient methods of action. John Foster's Essay on *Decision of Character* he prized very highly, and frequently recommended.

The whole turn of Dr. Wayland's mind was practical. He measured the value of knowledges by their bearing on human welfare. He looked at philosophical theories in their relation to the conduct of life. And he was broad in his sympathies. He was interested in the common people, and an active promoter of whatever promised them elevation or an increase of happiness. His sense of the value of mechanical inventions is indicated in a half humorous remark that he once made respecting an ingenious instrument for manufacturing screws, that he would rather be the inventor of that machine than be the author of the *Iliad*. He was a determined advocate of free-trade in a State largely devoted to manufactures. We believe that in earlier days he was a democrat in his party associations; but he hated slavery, and acted with those who resisted its encroachments. With a deep respect for order and law, he still occasionally betrayed, as some would think, a tendency to radical opinions. It was partly from his sympathy with the mass of the people, that he was led in the latter part of his life to advocate an essential modification of the system of college education, in order to open the doors of college to a larger number,—a plan, to say the least, of doubtful expediency.

Able men, who do not read extensively, are apt to have their pet books. This was probably true of Dr. Wayland. We do not count here Shakespeare and Walter Scott, the two authors to whom he most frequently referred,—a homage for whom would be no peculiarity; but we have in mind works of a different stamp. He recommended to the writer of these remarks, on beginning to study theology, Campbell's *Dissertations on the Gospels*, as not only a capital book, but as the book most deserving the attention of a theological student. Other examples of a like partiality, not, perhaps, entirely warranted, might be mentioned.

As a teacher, Dr. Wayland had preëminent gifts. If he did not, like Socrates, follow up the pupil with a perpetual cross-examination, he set before himself the same end,—that of eliciting the pupil's own mental activity. He aimed to spur him to the work of thinking for himself, and of thinking soundly. He had a spice of humor in his nature, and this lent additional zest to his terse, colloquial expressions in the classroom. The truth that there is nothing new under the sun, as far as the essential traits of man are concerned, he embodied in the saying, that "human nature has very few new tricks." On one occasion he had listened with his usual patience to the persistent questioning of a pupil as to *how* we know a certain intuitive truth or axiom. At length, his previous answers not having silenced the inquirer, he broke out with the emphatic response:—"how? by our *innate, inborn gumption!*" In these amicable conflicts with his pupils, he never took an unfair advantage, or contended for victory. On the contrary, he seemed desirous, as he really was, to do full justice to every objection, and, in alluding to writers who differed from him, to speak of them with personal respect. When the class of which the writer was a member took up the introductory part of his *Moral Science*, he mentioned that his views on the theory of Ethics had been controverted by Dr. N. W. Taylor, who, he added, was the ablest metaphysician in the country; and he told us where to find Dr. Taylor's adverse criticisms. Dr. Wayland exacted work of his pupils. He did not adopt the notion that studies are to be made so easy as not to require exertion. He thought that the mind should be trained to wrestle with a difficult subject. To remove from the intellect its infirmities and distempers,—as it were, with the aid of chloroform, the patient lying passive,—was not a process that accorded with his ideas of education. He demanded of his pupils carefully prepared recitations, and called on them to give, in their own words, an analysis of what they recited.

Dr. Wayland was a plain, thoughtful, solemn preacher. His early discourse on the Moral Dignity of the Missionary Enterprise, is the most famous of his sermons; and it contains very eloquent passages. The whole tenor of it agrees with the

lofty tone of his feeling. But that discourse does not very well exemplify the ordinary character of his pulpit addresses. His method was to unfold his theme by lucid explanations and arguments, and then to add a very brief conclusion, in which he threw the responsibility upon the hearers for acting in obedience to the truth which had been presented. The marked characteristic of his preaching was his habit of addressing the conscience. This he did with rare directness and strong effect. His entire freedom from every species of religious cant, and his obvious sincerity and independence, imparted peculiar force to his declarations. It was evident that he felt himself what he wanted others to feel. He had himself thoroughly assimilated the truth which he inculcated upon his audience.

Dr. Wayland is widely known as an author. The missionary sermon, to which we have alluded, appeared in a volume of well written discourses, which early gave the writer some celebrity. His *University Sermons* are of much later date. They contain his views of Christian doctrine. One of the most,—perhaps the most original and characteristic of his productions was the little treatise on the *Limitations of Human Responsibility*. He probably did not adhere to all the opinions expressed in this book,—for example, to his idea as to the power of Congress with reference to slavery in the District of Columbia. But his strong respect for the rights of the individual, and his predilection for personal, as distinguished from associated, action, is forcibly brought out. His *Elements of Moral Science* has proved itself a useful and popular work. The theoretical part is not marked by any special discrimination, and is, on the whole, inferior to the practical, in which the wisdom of the author has an appropriate field. His textbook on *Political Economy* presents only the bare rudiments of that science, and does not pretend to originality. Yet it is our conviction that, had Dr. Wayland devoted himself to the investigation of this subject, he would have made himself a master. The simple but comprehensive generalizations of this science, not less than its direct utility, were congenial with the prevailing bent of his mind. It was natural for him to give a large space in his *Intellectual Philosophy* to rules

and practical counsels for the discipline and use of the intellect. It is another proof of the decided predominance of the practical over the speculative elements in his mental constitution.

Dr. Wayland's conversation was quite attractive. His mind was always awake and active; he was quick at repartee, and his manners were courteous. If his remarks, made without premeditation in the family, or social circle, could be gathered up, they would form the most valuable monument of the character of his mind.

It was, however, in the capacity of a religious counselor and friend, that the noblest side of Dr. Wayland appeared. In the administration of the college discipline, he governed with a strong hand, and students feared his displeasure. The prompt, summary measures which he sometimes took, might strike the offender, at least, as somewhat despotic. The Doctor often expressed his admiration of Homer's picture of Jupiter, wherein the god is described as shaking Olympus by his mere nod. In the exercise of authority he aimed to be as sparing of words as possible. Although he had a paternal feeling towards his pupils, the spirit of his government, combined with the perceived dignity of his character, excited a degree of fear. They looked up to him, admired him, were proud of him, but in many cases never came into any closer relation. But when the opportunity was given to him to impart religious advice and encouragement to any one, he appeared in a wholly different attitude. His whole soul was moved. He seemed then to be fully in his element. His tones and words were marked by a fatherly tenderness. He became in spirit a child. He listened with unwearied sympathy to the recital of doubts and difficulties, and the suggestions that he offered were most apposite and judicious. We are inclined to think that when he was not engaged in the direct work of recommending the Gospel to the souls of men, he felt himself to be aloof from his highest calling—to be away from home. Hence, towards the end of life, he doubted whether he had not made a mistake in leaving the pastoral office. Religion was the controlling motive in his character. His strong nature needed, and it experi-

enced, the tempering influence of Christian principles. Under their power, although his indignation was easily kindled, it was generally directed against things that are morally odious. His oldest colleague,* whose noble and lovely traits of character are a theme of common remark among all who have enjoyed his instructions, has paid a just tribute to the humility and magnanimity of his friend. Dr. Wayland was no sectarian. The atmosphere of sectarian animosity would have been too confined for him to breathe. In many conversations which the writer had with him on topics of religious doctrine and duty, he never sought to exert an influence in favor of the peculiar tenets of the respectable denomination to which he himself belonged. He never adverted to them in any way. Once when the subject came up without any suggestion from him, he remarked that when the various Protestant denominations came to the hand-to-hand conflict with the Roman Catholic Church, each of them would have to give up something. He left on us the impression that whilst he agreed with his denomination respecting the proper mode and subjects of Baptism, he was not an advocate of restricted communion. But this is, perhaps, more a conjecture than an inference, and may be quite incorrect. Of this we are certain, that he was a truly liberal Christian.

At the outset of these remarks, it was said that there was more in Dr. Wayland than any analysis of his mind and character would be apt to suggest. When he died, a great and good man passed away from the earth.

* Professor Alexia Caswell.

ARTICLE X.—THE REFORMATION OF THE SOUTH.

Presidential Proclamations of Emancipation, and Amnesty.

First Message of President Johnson to the Senate and House of Representatives, December, 1865.

Official Report of Lieut. Gen. Grant, July 22d, 1865.

The Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, passed by Congress during the session of 1864-5, and submitted to the States.

Reports on Evangelization at the West, and South, and on Church Building adopted by the National Council of the Congregational Churches of the United States, convened at Boston, June, 1865.

Annual Reports of the American Home Missionary Society, American Missionary Association, American Congregational Union, 1865.

The American Union Commission, New York City.

National Freedman's Relief Association.

WE have been looking about for a proper title to this Article, whose theme can be easily inferred from the references at its head. *Reconstruction* is the popular phrase, which is blazoned in capitals at the top of leaded editorials, and among the published resolutions of caucuses of all political parties. We demur, however, against this term, because of the idea which it contains; and if we eschew the thing we are not going to retain the word. Reconstruction is rebuilding on the old site the structure which time or violence has destroyed, and implies a retention of the original plan, and of similar materials. He who should erect a marble temple where a Bastille had been burned could not by any proper use of language be said to have been engaged in the work of reconstruc-

tion. Nor is this a mere quibble, for there lies at its root the great principles at stake in the discussions of this hour, and which must be settled either by the *reconstruction* of the South with its traditions, and laws, and ideas, as before open rebellion, or the *reformation* of the South in harmony with freedom, and justice, and humanity, and therefore with a true and pure republicanism.

The lovers of peace and good order in the loyal States desire the restoration of civil courts, of municipal governments, of State legislatures, and of Governors elected by the people in those sections which have been engaged in an attempt to overthrow the general government, and to nationalize slavery. But no intelligent lover of liberty, no sincere patriot, desires the restoration of those ideas, and sentiments, and institutions, which caused the atrocious treason, and inspired the bloody rebellion. We are at issue with Mr. Clingman of North Carolina, who, in his published letter retailing the old slander about fanaticism, insists that the loyal people, who have saved the Republic, should not object if the Southerners select for places of authority both at home and in Congress, their former leaders, by whom they were induced to take up arms against the government, and upon whom rests the blood of our bravest and best slain in these battles for law and liberty.

Mr. Clingman, formerly member of the United States Congress, and late General in the armies of the so-called and now extirpated Confederacy, guilty by his own confession of infamous treason, and only submitting to force, should understand that the Republic is not henceforth to be administered by rebels, pardoned or unpardoned, and that their only course of safety is in the modest retirement and lonely contrition of deep, thorough repentance. This resolve of the North, spoken emphatically in the recent elections, should be attentively heeded by all who would live in peace under the banner which has been restored to its ancient supremacy, despite their folly and fury. We insist on a radical change in the construction of Southern society on new institutions and new ideas, and therefore different teachers and leaders. We want

not reconstruction, but reformation; not restoration, but regeneration,

“With sweeter manners, purer laws.”

We propose to survey the difficulties and the instrumentalities which exist in connection with that grand work to which we are summoned by divine providence at the close of a bloody conflict, and which will only be rendered decisive by the reorganization of Southern society on the basis of liberty, and under the direction of truer and nobler ideas.

The sudden termination of the war, the assassination of the President, and the new questions which immediately arose in respect to the disbanding of the vast armies in the field, the funding of the national debt, the policy to be pursued in the treatment of the conquered, and of the emancipated, necessarily diverted attention from the actual achievements of victory, and have hitherto prevented a calm estimate of what has been accomplished. Mr. Phillips, pampering that lust for notoriety, the mastering passion, which is in him what opium eating or dramdrinking is in others, and which must be fed at any cost, delivers his lecture on “The South Victorious.” Even the truer hearted and loyal, trembling lest the old regime may leap to power, distrust every step toward reconciliation, and decry the past as though it were to prove ineffectual. Noisy brawlers at the South try to soothe their defeat by using the meaningless phrase “subjugated but not subdued,” by which we suppose is intended, humiliated but not humble. We can afford to hear with magnanimity the muttering of those smarting under the rod which has brought them to their knees. Yet, before we consider the future, it were wise to inquire what has been effected, and then we may ascertain what remains to be done, and how it can be wrought.

What has been already achieved? We have conquered rebellion, we have destroyed slavery, and are masters of the situation.

Lient. Gen. Grant's campaign around Richmond, ending with the surrender of Robert E. Lee, on the ninth of last April, was the crowning proof that the government would

admit of no compromise with the doctrine of secession, or with its leaders. The victory of the government has been thorough and permanent, admitting no denial. While our blood tingles at the modest recital of the events of that last heroic week, we cannot forget what would have been the result had we had that other General at the head of our army, or worse yet, in the Executive chair, who, after inglorious failure, whimpered in accepting the nomination for the Presidential chair, "The Union is the one condition of peace, we ask no more," and whose party was ready with that motto to make any concession, and sink under any burden, if it could thereby induce the slaveholders to resume the mastery of the Republic. We ought to thank God night and morning that we have escaped so miserable a fate, and that Jefferson Davis is neither President of the United States, nor even Secretary of State, under a double-faced sycophant, for from all this we have been delivered.

The prophecies of the world have been proved false, and the Southern rebellion is extinct, its armies scattered like chaff before the whirlwind, its government crushed and annihilated, its securities worthless, and its adherents obliged to accept pardon, or flee from justice. Without vain glory, and without any desire to taunt the defeated, the fact should be remembered devoutly, and maintained clearly, that the Republic has conquered! This is palpable. The sacrifice of the last four years in property, and in precious life, has been rewarded, and the graves of our soldiers in every State hold the soil where they fell, and are protected by the flag for which they fought. This fact shuts the mouth of Southern bluster, and forbids any further appeal to arms, while punishment has been inflicted upon treason through the loss of life, the devastation of homes, the blasting of high expectations, the chief conspirators meanwhile gnashing their teeth in impotent malice.

Then we have destroyed the occasion of the conflict, and wiped out the hideous crime of American slavery. The war did not close until that rank offense was removed, and four millions of bondmen were emancipated. There is to-day no slave of any color in these United States, no man who has not the right to his time and labor, to his wife and children, and

who does not know that this is his right! Liberty has been proclaimed and bestowed; and the century has not witnessed a sublimer triumph than this bringing up of a race from the house of bondage; nor one which imposes such solemn responsibility. Moreover, we are masters of the position, and can dictate our own terms of reconciliation. Whatever theory is adopted concerning the political standing of the communities recently in rebellion, whether they are held to have acted as sovereign States, and by the act of secession to have destroyed themselves, and to have no longer any existence, so that they are to be new created through a territorial organization, or whether they are regarded as still in being, although individual conspirators obtained possession of them for a time, and held them as a foreign enemy might Massachusetts, and therefore, these States are to be recovered from treasonable usurpation; yet, on either hypothesis, the United States government has the authority to decide when these States are thus rescued, and until this is declared, there is no complete reconciliation and full restoration of powers and privileges. The President, by his proclamations and published correspondence, has assumed this to be the status; and Congress, by declining to admit the members elected from these States, has endorsed the position of the Executive, while the various conventions and legislatures of the States themselves have accepted the position of suppliants who must comply with the terms enjoined, and only ask what is required to gain recognition by the government, instead of arrogantly listening to that pitiful appeal of Northern cowardice: "The union is the one condition of peace, we ask no more." We have conquered rebellion, destroyed slavery, and have the adjustment of the difficulty in our own decision, responsible only to our own consciences and to God.

This gives importance to the next question, What remains to be accomplished? The answer is brief. The securing for the future what has already been gained! Were we sure of holding what we now possess, the safety of the Republic would be secure, so far as its power, purity, and permanence have been imperiled by this conspiracy. Prevent the possi-

bility of any similar rebellion, maintain universal freedom, both in rights and speech, and what further guarantees need be demanded? The mistake is common that we are to obtain new victories, when, in reality, we only need to retain those already achieved. The sole danger is that when military rule is withdrawn, these advantages may be lost, that the poor man, both black and white, may be again reduced to a state of serfdom, and no utterance be permitted which denies the divine right of an oligarchy. The simple effort should be, for example, to render perpetual in New Orleans that liberty of thought, and speech, and labor, and that suppression of the rebellious mind and temper, which exists to-day. How to ensure that is the problem whose solution readjusts every difficulty and bestows rightful dominion to those ideas which have triumphed in this bloody war. The main obstacle to this result is the ignorance and obstinacy of the subdued multitude, chafing under the scourge of righteous retribution. Nevertheless, one cannot reflect upon the situation of the conquered rebels, who have lost so much for nothing, without feeling inclined to indulge patience at their sullenness, especially in the thought of what would have been our sentiments had the tables been turned. Much perplexity exists in respect to the actual temper of the Southern population. The intelligent, middling classes, including the rank and file of their surrendered armies, know that they have been thoroughly whipped, and are ready to accept the decision as final. The scheming demagogues, the slave-aristocracy, and the low rabble, with the women, and the pro-slavery ministers of an apostate Christianity, are bitter and rebellious, and refuse to be comforted; while the freedmen distrust their old masters, cherish illusive fancies, and, not yet relieved of their shell, drag about the encumbrance, from which they are emerging into a new and larger sphere.

How are we to secure our advantages in this condition of things, and among this people? This is the question of reconstruction, or, as we put it, of Southern reformation.

The President has laid down his plan, which is admirably adapted for the purpose, so far as legislative action by the

state authorities can pledge the people. President Johnson demands first, that the act of secession be not repealed, but pronounced *null* and *void*—having no legal validity or authority. That is a solemn confession of guilt, and of repentance, and is a full declaration that the lawful government of these United States was right in the war, and has subjugated the rebellion. That placed upon the statute book of every State whose inhabitants were engaged in this stupendous conspiracy, would settle both the crime and folly of secession under the Constitution beyond controversy.

President Johnson demands, secondly, the adoption of the Constitutional Amendment which has been passed by both Houses of Congress, and is as follows:

“Art. xiii. Sec. 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime of which the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

“Sec. 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.”

This action of the States is enjoined by the Executive as a pledge on their part that they will respect the proclamation of emancipation, and henceforth require universal freedom as their organic law.

The adoption of this amendment is submission to the abolition of slavery, and to the right of the general government to protect the laborer. No calculation can exceed the importance of such a pledge, if carried out in good faith, and when that amendment is passed legally, this will have to be performed. That rule alters the structure of Southern society, and conforms it to the idea of the Republic, and therefore will hinder rebellion and create a homogeneity which must perpetuate the nation. The abolition of slavery, by this amendment, annuls at once all laws which have impaired the freedom of the black man, and reinstates him instantly in the right to hold property and to testify in courts; for over this the Supreme Court has jurisdiction, while Congress has authority to enforce by its enactments these prerogatives of liberty. That settled, there

is no possibility that slavery can be re-enacted, or any system of peonage permitted.

President Johnson demands, finally, that the rebel debt be repudiated,—both that incurred by so called States, in rebellion, and by the so called Confederacy. This is a guarantee against any future conspiracy—a public avowal of utter defeat, and a merited punishment to traitors at home, and their sympathizers abroad. So far as enactments can secure the gains of our victory, these would seem sufficient; but we are strongly of Speaker Colfax's opinion, that before these terms are regarded as having been accepted, they should be acceded to by a majority of the voters in each State, and not merely by conventions or legislatures; and until the popular will is thus expressed through the ballot-box, the Commonwealth should be regarded as not delivered from the enemy, and be held under martial law.

Congress has also declared that no one who has been active in the rebellion shall presume to appear as a member of either house. That law, if it was passed as a measure of safety in war, should be retained in peace as the just penalty of treason, and as the surest means of destroying the oligarchy which has tyrannized over the country for the last twenty-five years. Supposing that the oath prescribed were somewhat too stringent, yet the dignity and safety of the Republic require the passage of a law forever debarring any person from a Southern State from occupying a seat in either house of Congress, who has ever held any office under the national government and been afterward active in the rebellion, or who has held any rank above that of colonel in the armies of treason.

We must have another school of statesmen from that section in place of the Tombeses, Benjamins, Masons, Slidells, and Davises, even though Mr. Clingman pleads that they may be permitted to retain their representative men. The South must be represented by a different order of statemanship, if it would be admitted to a share in the administration of the general government.

Legislation can scarcely go further, but this will not effect the reform which bestows a vital unity, and the blessedness of

peace established in righteousness. Accomplish all this, and the masses still in their ignorance will be the easy prey of any crafty political adventurer, and the ready tools for unprincipled demagogues. These guarantees do not settle the labor question, which threatens the gravest perils. These votes alone will not convert the Southern mind and heart to the adoption of Northern principles, or to the honoring of free thought and free speech.

There is a work outside of legislation, whether by Congress or by States,—a work beyond the power of the executive, and the decisions of the judiciary,—which is more necessary than all, and without which their efforts, however judicious and patriotic, will be futile. A large class are content to charge upon the administration all evil in the land, and assume to be censors without responsibility, but every citizen is a ruler in the Republic, and the moral influences exerted in connection with associated labor are the real energies which will accomplish the true reformation of the South, and regenerate the Republic. Some of the difficulties which have been apprehended in the readjustment of public affairs will find an easy solution under the law of supply and demand. The necessity of food and clothing will constrain the poor man, of whatever color, to labor, and the landed proprietor, who has no capital but his plantation, to divide it, while competition will aid in protecting the laborer and ensuring fair wages. Immigration will readily accept the tempting offer, and will require no foreign assistance when order is re-established, and profit is well assured. Hence must gradually but certainly proceed kindlier sentiments, for the interchange of trade will tend to a better understanding. The abolition of slavery will remove that hindrance of free communion which has estranged these sections of the Republic, and will also radically transform the commercial customs so as to elevate the whole community, and not divide and isolate it into classes. A few will no longer buy the poorest and cheapest articles for the many, but every laborer will consult his own taste and means of expenditure, and therefore the merchants will no longer pander to the master, but will conciliate the humbler and more numerous customers, who from very ne-

cessity must pay cash, and thus the interests of the tradesmen and the workmen will be identical. This inevitable result, which will be felt in every manufactory of the North, in the quality of the articles prepared for the Southern trade, must have an educational power over the masses, that has not been sufficiently regarded. The freedman who has two or five bales of cotton will acquire shrewdness by the process of selling them and expending the proceeds, and he will be treated with high consideration by the competing factors, whether immediately allowed the privilege of suffrage or not. The Divine is stronger than the human, and when God has decreed the removal of a wrong, the men who would stay the purpose of the Almighty throw themselves into the mire to be trodden under foot. There is no reason for discouragement in the future of public affairs, but rather for perseverance in securing our gains, and in retaining our successes, and also for patience in awaiting the slow but sure process of reconciliation and renovation which must ensue upon the suppression of the rebellion, and the abolition of slavery.

Nevertheless, there is a work above anything that Congress or any natural law can accomplish, which is imperative upon the patriot and the Christian. While the country is in its transition state between war and peace, between rebellion and loyalty, between slavery and freedom, there will be inevitable suffering,—the pains of a heavy travail. The thousands distrustful of their former enemies, and not comprehending the duties of freedom, are to-day in peril of starvation, and may be tempted to crime in order to obtain the means of subsistence. Thousands of the whites impoverished by their failure in a war which has been no school of virtue, would rather live by violence than industry. Thousands more, unfitted for the new regime, only pine and sigh for the past with its unpaid toil and despotic ease. Thousands yet of loyal refugees are unable to regain their homes in safety, being regarded with malignity, and so are drifting about as homeless strangers. These temporal wants appeal to our benevolence and ought to be heeded.

The interests of public education which have never been regarded at the South must be now considered, or we lose an essential element of reconciliation and of vital reformation.

Nothing shows so conclusively the absolute aristocracy of Southern society as the ignorance in which the masses of the white population were kept by their laws and customs. In some of the States, as in Alabama, where there was a school fund, it was so ingeniously distributed, that the rich planter was able to use it for the *private* instruction of *his* children, while his poor neighbor could not touch a penny for the benefit of his family. The creation of a system of common schools throughout the Southern States for the entire population would be a far richer boon and a far stronger safeguard than universal suffrage, and this should be comprehended by the statesmen who are planning for the good of the Republic.

Our soldiers can testify to the barbarism of vast regions and the need of a new and higher teaching in morality, but we cannot expect this from those ministers of religion who have succumbed to the dictates of slavery, and defended it, with all its licentiousness, as a divine institution, much less from those politicians who have rolled treason as a sweet morsel under their tongues, and have gained office by the ignorance that attends upon the lowest vices.

It is gratifying to observe the instrumentalities which have been provided in the good providence of God to meet these emergencies, and which only need to be sustained with snitable energy to supply all that is required, to supplement the acts of government and the processes of natural law, for achieving triumphantly that reformation of the South which will ensure harmony, preserve liberty, advance temporal prosperity, and disappoint again all such predictions of disunion as those which that stubborn Englishman, Dr. Vaughan, has again ventured upon, who, not having learned modesty by the failure of his former prophecy, has gone home, after a few weeks' tarry in the United States, to speak dogmatically about the certainty of another line of cleavage at some future time!

The American Union Commission, under the sanction of government, have undertaken to aid the white population of the South in their destitution, to supply them with seed and tools, to coöperate with the free school party in furnishing competent teachers, and in establishing systems of free public edu-

cation, while, also, affording information at the North concerning the present condition and prospects of that region to facilitate emigration.

The Freedmen's Commission and the American Missionary Association are engaged in relieving the temporal necessities of the emancipated, in aiding, under the Freedmen's Bureau, their struggle to obtain proper remuneration for labor, and in imparting to them the rudiments of knowledge,—the latter society also caring for their moral and religious improvement.

The American Home Missionary Society, and the American Congregational Union, are coöperating in the attempt to aid the organization of loyal Christians, in the Southern cities, into churches of Christ, after the model of those founded by the New England Pilgrims,—with a free and godfearing brotherhood, and a pure, fearless, and intelligent ministry.

The National Council of Congregationalists at Boston recommended that seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars should be raised during the year to aid the three societies who cover this whole field of the South, in implanting moral and religious influences; and it is meet that the principles of New England, which have triumphed in the carnal fight, should advance to larger and complete victory in the spiritual conflict.

The existence of such organizations is a token of Divine favor, proving that we are not to be forsaken, but that he who has led us safely through the battle against armed rebellion is ready to be our champion in the nobler warfare with principalities and powers in high places, with the kingdom of darkness in its spiritual usurpation.

The origin of our Constitutional Government is to be found in the New England Colonies, whose civil organization was the evolution of their Christian faith and ecclesiastical polity. The Puritan church was the germ of the individual State, and of the United States. The difficulties which foreigners experience in comprehending our civil constitution is mainly owing to their ignorance of that Congregational church order which was its germinal force. The Republic owes its preservation to that religious system by which it was originated. The rebels instinctively hated the ideas which were embodied in

New England, but the Puritan principles have proved mightier than their adversaries.

Had not Congregationalism extended its domain by sending its missionaries, planting churches, and disseminating its ideas through its children, we doubt if the loyalty of the Northern and of the Middle States could have been preserved. The valor which has won the fight, and sloughed off the ulcers of secession and slavery, has come from the virtue and constancy of Puritan Christianity.

Congregationalism has, therefore, an interest in the conservation of our free government, which pertains to no other church order; and, at this crisis, the progress of the two and their preservation are correlative. Destroy our republican institutions, and these churches would be merged in ecclesiastical forms suited to monarchical ideas; and on the other side, if New England Congregationalism were to perish, there would be small hope for the life of the Republic, notwithstanding the great multitude of loyal members in churches of a different constitution.

Why have our Congregational churches never taken root South of Mason and Dixon's line? Because their principles were hostile to Southern ideas and institutions. What will save these subdued rebels and their States to the Republic? Nothing but the reception of the elements of Puritan Christianity. It is notorious that the majority of Northern emigrants, who, before the war, had settled at the South, were among the vilest rebels, and worked vast mischief to the government. How was it that these men, educated in our schools, became the uncompromising advocates of slavery, and the right of secession? The answer is in the fact that Southern society was so impregnated with these errors, that a young man who went there found both pecuniary gain and social standing depended on his subserviency, and he was speedily transformed by the subtle and irresistible power of the opinions which swayed the community in custom, conversation, commerce, and policy, and which girded him with their moulding energy in his amusements, his toils, and his devotion, on change, in the saloon, the steamboat, the theatre, or the sanctu-

ary. The individual was lost in this social influence as a pure drop falling from the clouds is lost in the salt wave of a receding tide.

What will hinder this for the future? Nothing but the marshaling and organizing of those eternal truths which oppose these falsehoods, in vital combinations, disciplined and invigorated to resist with associated strength the evil and encourage the right. Withdraw the army, and the Southern territory would be held mainly by the former slaveholders, their old prejudices embittered by defeat, ready to entrap the unwary who ventured within their enchantments to abjure their convictions of justice and humanity, by the chaffer of trade, by the promise of profit, by the hope of political preferment, and by the solemn quotation of Scripture. Neither Richmond, nor Savannah, nor Mobile, nor New Orleans would be secure for a thorough loyalty, were the general government to withdraw its forces; and already Northern tradesmen are striving in some of these cities to thrive by retailing the old curses against abolitionism and denouncing the Freedmen's Bureau. How is this to be hindered, when it is incumbent upon the government to relinquish its gripe and permit a return to self-control as speedily as possible? The most feasible, economical, and powerful method of guarding against this peril and preserving freedom, is by the establishment of churches of the New England faith and order, which shall combine the disintegrated loyalty and the piety of the South into organic union with Northern ideas. Every such congregation, with its free pulpit, is a testimony for the supremacy of law and truth, and must work like leaven for the renovation of public morality, holding the community to sound views of political economy, and to the higher faith in charity, and right, and Christ. The best men from the North would naturally seek such a sanctuary for a religious home, and be thereby brought into the atmosphere of true republicanism, while enlarging the social forces of loyalty and liberty by their active coöperation. Herein lies the grandeur and promise of that responsibility which God has laid upon the churches which retain the principles and the order of the New England

fathers. No other denomination can work so readily and so efficiently and economically for the regeneration of the South. The same enthusiasm which marshaled loyal armies at the call of danger to the Republic, should inspire this movement to secure our triumph by crushing out the spirit of secession and planting there the love of liberty and righteous law, by securing all just rights to the emancipated, by diffusing the blessings of education, and by laying deep the foundations of good order and virtue and religion.

The mind falters in striving to imagine the glory of that new era which is opening upon our country, if we are faithful and vigilant. The present winter may be one of severe hardship to some sections, but by another harvest the call for benevolence in feeding the hungry and naked will have ceased, and labor will be in the quiet exercise of its industries. The return of prosperity will soften animosity, and the failure in the trial of strength will produce, even among rebels, content with existing arrangements. This recovered empire, whose Titanic energies put forth in the bloody wrestle are now working for the common good, rescued from the bane of weakness and dissension, must leap to the foremost rank by the development of its immense resources. Everything is hopeful, if we remain true to those principles which have conquered in this terrible conflict, and are earnest for the reformation of the South, and not for reconstruction under the old process of State sovereignty and the nationalizing of slavery. Never has a Christian people been summoned to a nobler task than that which is waiting for us in the education and evangelization of emancipated millions, and of their former masters. Never could the Church pray more confidently for the gift of the Holy Ghost in setting apart those gifted to lead in this heavenly service. We must seize the passing moment, ere society has fallen into the ancient mould, and cast it into a higher form. We must not, however, expect instantaneous success, for the spiritual grows to its harvest far slower than the material, and in neither do we reap on the day of sowing; yet if faithful to our country, our ancestry, and our God, we may rejoice in the hope of realizing the dream of philanthropy and the expecta-

tion of prophecy, to the amazement and confusion of those who have deemed our Republic doomed. That peril which saddened the farewell of Washington, and which troubled the soul of every large-hearted and patriotic statesmen, has passed, and we are fairly at sea, beyond bar and quicksand; let us thank God and take courage! Let us, with the spirit of loving kindness, and words of gentleness, seek to enlighten and conciliate those who have misunderstood and therefore hated us, while we pray and labor to render this continent the refuge of the oppressed, the home of the free, the citadel of virtue, and the sanctuary of vital Christianity. Then will the seed corn brought over in the Mayflower have borne its fruit, and our country become that New England to found which the Pilgrims became exiles, and in hope of which they gladly toiled, suffered, and died.

ARTICLE XI.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL.

ESSAYS ON THE SUPERNATURAL ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY.*—Several of these Essays appeared originally in the *New Englander*, and the interest which they excited as well as the general favor with which they were received, led the author to rewrite them, to add others to them, and thus to make a somewhat complete series of Papers bearing upon the general subject described in the title. The contents of the volume are as follows: The Nature of the Conflict of Christian Faith with Skepticism and Unbelief; The Genuineness of the Fourth Gospel; Recent Discussions upon the Origin of the First Three Gospels; Baur on Parties in the Apostolic Church, and the Character of the Book of the Acts; Baur on Ebionitism, and the Origin of Catholic Christianity; The Mythical Theory of Strauss; Strauss' Restatement of his Theory; The Legendary Theory of Renan; The Critical and Theological Opinions of Theodore Parker; An Examination of Baur and Strauss on the Conversion of St. Paul; The Nature and Function of the Christian Miracles; The Testimony of Jesus concerning Himself; The Personality of God: in reply to the Positivist and the Pantheist. These topics are all treated by Professor Fisher in his uniformly clear and scholarlike manner. His treatment of each of them shows perfect familiarity with the most recent discussions by other writers. His well known lucidness of statement brings all the points which he makes within the easy comprehension of the attentive reader. It is rare that we find such subjects treated in a manner at once so thorough and so readable. The statement and refutation of the negative theories of F. C. Baur is alone worth the cost of the volume, for it supplies a want which has hitherto been unsatisfied in English, critical, and theological literature. The *ignotum pro magnifico* has had full oppor-

* *Essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity*, with special reference to the Theories of Renan, Strauss, and the Tübingen School. By Rev. GEORGE P. FISHER, A. M., Professor of Church History in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 580. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.50.

tunity to excite painful misgivings as to what this master in historical research might have unearthed. The occasion for such groundless fears need exist no longer. Any student of theology, any ordinary reader of the Scriptures, can understand the theories of Strauss and Baur, as set forth by Professor Fisher, and can weigh the reasons for and against them which he so impartially and lucidly expounds.

We greet this volume with welcome, because it is an indication that the interest in discussions purely theological has not died out, but rather promises to be revived. It is a good omen for the prosperity of learning, and enlightened learning, that such a volume as this should be issued and find readers.

The most of the positions taken in these discussions will meet with a general assent from believers in the supernatural origin of Christianity. Some of the views expressed in Chapters XI. and XIII. will not be accepted by all, and are fair subjects for discussion and criticism.

THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.*—The theological "formula" of this volume is that Christ is a sacrifice for us, because by his incarnation, life, and death, he manifested a sympathy for mankind which made him the power of God unto salvation. This sacrifice is "vicarious," because it is undertaken on behalf, and for the good of the sinful race. It is grounded on the principles of universal obligation, because in the providing of it, the "law-precpt was duly sanctified," "legal enforcements are not diminished," and "God's rectoral honor is effectively maintained." The result is that by the operation of the moral power of this exhibition of God's sympathy and sacrifice, the man who believes it, is made righteous, and this is justification by faith.

The "formula" of doctrine which Dr. Bushnell rejects and aims to overthrow,—or rather to displace,—may be best inferred from his own language. "By the previous exposition, Christ is shown to be a Saviour, not as being a ground of justification, but as being the moral power of God upon us, so a power of salvation. His work terminates, not in the release of penalties by our compensation, but in the transformation of character, and the rescue,

* *The Vicarious Sacrifice*, grounded in principles of universal obligations. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.

in that manner, of guilty men from the retributive causations provoked by their sin. He does not prepare the remission of sins in the sense of a mere letting go, but he executes the remission by taking away the sins, and dispensing the justification of life. This one word Life is the condensed import of all that he is, or undertakes to be." This means that the author distinctly and unequivocally rejects the doctrine that in any sense whatever, Christ by his work provides any ground or reason which renders it consistent for God to remit or pardon the deserved penalties of sin.

It will be seen from these statements that the author finds less import, though perhaps no less importance in the work of Christ, than is usually conceded to it, and than seems to be most distinctly taught in the Scriptures in every form of direct and indirect assertion. His "formula" of doctrine is narrower than that which is usually accepted. What he affirms to be true of the work of Christ, would be generally assented to; what he denies, would be affirmed in addition. The "formula" of the church is ampler, not narrower, than his. We do not assert that some of the truths which he enforces with so much eloquence and power, have been as warmly and distinctly recognized as they ought to have been; or that they have been as efficiently used in the practical creeds of Christian believers, or as clearly set forth in the instructions of Christian preachers, as was desirable. But they have always been received in theory. For what Dr. Bushnell and others have done, and are still doing, to revive their importance and their power, they deserve the hearty thanks of all lovers of truth.

But when Dr. Bushnell goes further and denies the other aspect of the work of Christ he opens anew the discussion of one of the most important questions in theology. It is a question which is profoundly agitating the minds of many thoughtful and inquiring spirits in the church and out of it at this very moment. Upon the solution of it he has bestowed the studious attention of years. He has brought to the support of his views an ingenious theory of ethical and theological philosophy. He has endeavored to square this theory with the representations of the Scriptures. In the prosecution of his arguments he has dealt very heavy and effective blows upon not a few false dogmas, and exposed the weakness of theories that however often refuted do yet maintain a most tenacious vitality. For all these reasons his work deserves, as it will doubtless receive, the attention of theological critics. Perhaps we may

return to it ourselves in a future number. In the meantime we can assure our readers that notwithstanding its material defects of doctrine, the volume contains many most important and quickening truths.

LECKY'S HISTORY OF RATIONALISM.*—By Rationalism the author does not understand any definite doctrines or criticisms, "but rather a certain cast of thought or bias of reasoning," which, he thinks, has during the last three centuries "gained a marked ascendancy in Europe." This tendency includes a disposition "to subordinate dogmatic theology to the dictates of reason and conscience, and to attribute all kinds of phenomena to natural rather than miraculous causes." Mr. Lecky sees in the course of modern history a waning sense of the supernatural, a decreasing influence of the belief in the preternatural world upon feeling and action, upon the individual mind, and upon society. His plan leads him over a large field, and his chapters are really a series of separate dissertations. In the first two chapters, he treats of the declining sense of the miraculous, as illustrated in the history of magic and witchcraft, and in the loss of faith in the ecclesiastical miracles. In the third chapter, he speaks of the "æsthetic, scientific, and moral Developments of Rationalism." This chapter contains interesting matter upon the subject of Christian art and poetry, and the mutations which art has undergone. The fourth chapter relates to Persecution. The remaining chapters discuss "the Secularization of Politics," and "the Industrial History of Rationalism."

The style in which these volumes is written is unusually attractive. There is an affluence of language, an animation and felicity of diction which keep the attention awake.

It cannot be said that the author is not well-informed; yet there has been too little original inquiry and research, and he follows French writers with a too evident partiality. Even if his statements are correct, they are frequently adapted to suggest very erroneous impressions respecting the persons and times which pass under his notice.

* *History of the Rise and Influence of Rationalism in Europe.* By W. E. H. LECKY, M. A. Two volumes. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. New Haven: H. C. Peck. Price \$5.

The argument of the book—so far as it has an argument—is strangely defective and faulty. The changes of feeling on the various topics which the author handles is traced to the *progress of civilization*, with the constant implication that the movement in question has gone forward independently of the influence of the Bible and of Christianity. But is not Christianity a vital element in modern civilization? And are not the downfall of superstition, the abandonment of persecution, and the securing of rights to the individual in political society really the result of the better understanding and more potent operation of Christianity itself?

When Mr. Lecky speaks of Calvinism, he caricatures it. He has no adequate knowledge of the theological opinions of the Calvinistic leaders whom he stigmatizes.

Yet this work is full of interest, and cannot fail to awaken valuable thoughts in the reader who has sufficient knowledge to remain unaffected by its fallacious reasonings.

HURST'S *HISTORY OF RATIONALISM*.*—This volume treats of Rationalism technically so called, and in this respect it differs from Lecky's more profound and philosophical work. It discusses Modern Rationalism, the Rationalism that has sprung up since the Protestant Reformation, and proposes to itself a narrower field of investigation than Farrar's *Critical History of Free Thought*. It is a history of Modern Rationalism in all countries, and is thus contrasted with Hagenbach's *German Rationalism*. The field is very wide, but the author has labored in every part of it with much pains-taking and careful research. He sketches the Rationalism of Germany, of Holland, of France, of Switzerland, of England, and of the United States from the earliest beginnings, down to the latest developments of each. His method is very uniform. He sketches the history, writings, and influence of the leading writers in each of these countries, and aims to be candid and fair in his representations. Much, if not the most of his information, is taken at second and third hand, as must necessarily be the case, so that his work is a kind of digest of critical sketch-

* *History of Rationalism*; embracing a survey of the present state of Protestant Theology. By the Rev. JOHN F. HURST, A. M., with Appendix of Literature. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1865. 8vo. pp. 623. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.50.

es, by other writers. For example, the representation of early parties in the church of England is drawn from Conybeare, his account of Coleridge and his theological opinions is derived from Riggs's *Modern Anglican Theology*, and from Professor Shedd's *Introduction to Coleridge's writings*. His history of the early condition of German Protestantism is taken from Tholuck. He has, however, sought the ablest authorities of this kind, and has spared no pains and faithfulness in using their contents.

The Appendix of Literature is very copious and convenient. The work is conceived in an earnestly Christian yet not illiberal spirit, and deserves a cordial reception from theological and also from general students and readers.

SMITH'S CONCISE DICTIONARY OF THE BIBLE.*—The "Dictionary of the Bible," edited by Dr. William Smith, and published (1860-63) in three large octavo volumes, is well known to many of our readers, and was favorably noticed in the *New Englander* at the time of its appearance.

The present work, which is substantially an abridgment of the larger one, and like it, an English work with the imprint of an American publishing house on its title page, is about equal in bulk to one of the original three volumes. We quote from the preface a brief statement of its origin and aim:

"This Condensation of the Dictionary of the Bible has been made by Mr. William Aldis Wright, M. A., Librarian of Trinity College, Cambridge, under the direction and superintendence of Dr. William Smith. It is intended to satisfy a generally expressed desire for a Concise Dictionary of the Bible, in a single volume, and at a moderate price, containing an account of the most recent Biblical studies in a form adapted for universal circulation."

In our opinion, this "Concise Dictionary" has some great excellencies and some prominent faults. It undoubtedly contains more proper names than any other Bible dictionary of its size in the English language; the amount of learning represented in its pages is greater than in any similar English work; it has the advantage

* *A Concise Dictionary of the Bible, comprising its Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History: being a condensation of the Larger Dictionary.* Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL. D., Classical Examiner in the University of London. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1865. Octavo, pp. 1032. Price \$6 in cloth.

of embracing the results of the latest investigations in every field; its articles are often admirable in their general scope and execution; but there is also abundantly manifest a lack of appreciation of the popular wants. The editors and many of the English contributors are scholars, and are more familiar with the demands of scholars and of the higher classes of English society; but they have not prepared a work adapted to the use of the great reading class of this country, who need a Bible dictionary not only comprehensive and accurate, but intelligible by itself,—at least, without the aid of dictionaries of other languages. Not only should Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Arabic terms, if they necessarily occur in the work, be generally translated into English, but all references to the Scriptures should be so made as to convey information to those who understand only the English language, and have only the English version of the Bible. Those who consult this dictionary will see the bearing of these remarks on the articles "Abdi, 3," "Achzib, 1," "Amos," "Azal," "Jeiel," and indeed on almost every page. We suggest further, that a Bible dictionary for popular use should make it an object to explain apparent inconsistencies in the Bible, instead of merely pointing them out (as in the articles "Aceldama," "Ahaziah, 2," &c.), and then leaving them as so many stumbling-blocks.

We notice that this "Concise Dictionary" is especially deficient in regard to maps. Robinson's *Calmet* and Kitto's *Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature* are both far superior to it in this respect. The pronunciation of this new dictionary appears to have been systematically altered from that of the larger dictionary; it differs in innumerable instances from that which is prevalent among us; it is often inconsistent with itself, and in many cases even the number of syllables in a proper name cannot be determined from it. So numerous are these alterations that we looked to see if Jon'athan and Josh'ua were not changed to Jo'nathan and Jo'shua to correspond with other like alterations.

The exclusion of American names from the "List of Contributors to the Original Work" was a noticeable feature of the first imported copies of the "Concise Dictionary:" but there has recently appeared at the beginning of the volume a new leaf substituted (probably by the American publishers) for the one first inserted and on this new leaf a new "List," embracing with the other contributors the names of four Americans, viz: Prof. G. E. Day, Prof.

H. B. Hackett, Prof. C. E. Stowe, and J. P. Thompson, D. D., (wrongly spelled *Thomson*), who furnished numerous important articles for the larger dictionary.

We will only add that this "Concise Dictionary" has a great amount of valuable matter from which and other accessible materials there might be made a better dictionary of the Bible for popular use than any now extant in England or America; and the preparation and publication of such a dictionary would be an important service to the cause of the Bible and of Christianity.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

JOHN STUART MILL'S DISSERTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS.*—In our last number, we noticed the publication by Mr. Spencer of the critiques of the Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton, by Mr. Mill. We have since received a collection of his Dissertations and Discussions previously issued by the same publisher in a similar style. We cannot commend too highly the beauty of all these volumes, nor the value of their contents. We have already disavowed our discipleship to his views and our aversion to the direction of his philosophy. But a knowledge of his opinions and a familiarity with his writings are almost a necessity to every well educated man. There are few living writers who deserve to be counted among "representative men" as John Stuart Mill. It is true that in England the number of his professed adherents and disciples is small, much smaller than it is in this country, and yet in England he represents an important element of the public sentiment of the country. Though opposed by the power of caste and of the church; though the traditions, the beliefs, and the prejudices of the ruling and the educated classes are against him, the small, yet select band of reformers, especially in politics and finance, acknowledge him as one of their great leaders. His theological views and his religious position are, unhappily, such as to cast him off from the cordial sympathies of many who are at one with him in liberal principles. A necessitarian in psychology, a rejecter of all *a priori* beliefs in metaphysics, and a known disbeliever in the supernatural origin of

* *Dissertations and Discussions; Political, Philosophical, and Historical*, by JOHN STUART MILL. In three volumes. Boston: William V. Spencer. 1865. 12mo.

Christianity, he must, of course, be superficial and inconsequent in his philosophy. It might be thought that he must, therefore, be an unsafe and even a dangerous guide to the uninstructed and to the young. On the other hand, he is so candid in his temper, so critical in his analysis and statement of his own opinions, and so fair in his appreciating and exhibiting the views of his opponents, that he is at once the least dangerous and the most instructive of all modern philosophical free-thinkers. To those who must necessarily acquaint themselves with views that are antagonist to their own, in order that they may learn the strongest things that can be said against the opinions which they regard as true, it is almost a necessity to be familiar with the philosophy of Mill. Students of metaphysics and theology can learn as much from the right use of the principal writings of Mill as from the stoutest defender of liberty and of intuitive truth.

These three volumes of his *Dissertations* contain the principal papers which he has contributed for a long course of years to the quarterly and other journals of England. They were all designated by himself. The American edition is introduced by a preface from his own pen, and it includes his recently published treatise *On Utilitarianism*. These papers are upon a very wide range of topics; literary, political, metaphysical, and biographical. The first volume leads off with his interesting and much read paper on the contest in America, contributed to *Frazer's Magazine* in February, 1862. This is followed by a discussion of the right and wrong of state interference with corporation and church property. An interesting paper occurs among others on Professor Sedgwick's discourse on the studies of the University of Cambridge—a biographical critical article upon Armand Carrel, another upon Jeremy Bentham. The second volume contains, among others, articles upon Coleridge, De Tocqueville's Democracy in America, Bailey's Berkeley's Theory of Vision. The third has papers upon the enfranchisement of woman, Dr. Whewell on Moral Philosophy, and Grote's History of Greece. As almost every paper which Mr. Mill brings before the public is elaborate and principled, so to speak, it will at once be very properly inferred that these volumes contain a very attractive and various collection of papers of permanent value.

JOHN STUART MILL ON THE "POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY OF AUGUSTE COMTE.*—Closely following upon the *Dissertations, &c.*, Mr. Spencer has given the public in a small volume, uniform with them, two papers of Mr. Mill upon the philosophy of Auguste Comte, partly expository of his system, and partly critical. As Mr. Mill was the first English writer who avowed himself a partial disciple of the great positivist, and has made a careful study of his works, we presume that we have a fair account of the chief points of his system, so far, at least, as it bears upon metaphysical and social sciences. And perhaps no volume gives so clear and succinct a view of these features of his philosophy.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF REV. F. W. ROBERTSON.†—This is a profoundly but painfully interesting biography. The sermons of Robertson have been generally recognized as productions of genius. They are marked by originality of thought, a most remarkable power of developing Scripture, and a wonderful condensation and precision of language. The curiosity to know more of the personal history of one whose character is so mildly reflected in his writings, is natural. We learn from these volumes that Robertson's life was, on the whole, a sorrowful one. With a strong desire to take up the military profession, he gratified his friends so far as to renounce his chosen pursuit and devote himself to the Christian ministry. At the outset of his career he was "Evangelical" in his religious opinions,—read the lives of Brainerd and Henry Martyn with deep sympathy, and mastered Edwards. His mind became unsettled respecting the doctrines of religion, and he passed through a trying inward conflict. He passed some time in the Tyrol during this period of mental agitation, and returned to England with a new system of Christian belief. A new crystallization followed upon the commotion which had broken up his previous connections. Exactly what this new creed was, the biographer does not inform us; but on other points the reader o

* *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte.* By JOHN STUART MILL. Boston: William V. Spencer 1865. 12mo. pp. 182.

† *Life and Letters of Frederic W. Robertson, M. A., Incumbent of Trinity Chapel, Brighton, 1847-53.* Edited by STOFFORD A. BROOKE, M. A., late Chaplain to the Embassy at Berlin. 2 vols. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1865. \$4.

Robertson's sermons need hardly be instructed. His divergence from the accepted forms of doctrine, as well as his practical and effectual sympathy with the working men of Brighton, where he resided, excited against him much ill-will and suspicion. He drew around him, however, a large congregation of friends and supporters. The opposition which he experienced wore upon his heart. For with intense independence, courage, and honesty, he combined an equally intense craving for sympathy. This natural sensibility, together with a sense of loneliness that haunted him, rendered the later portion of his ministry an extremely sorrowful record.

This memoir is well and judiciously written. The letters of Robertson are full of interest and often exhibit the force and richness of his mind. A fine specimen of his power is the spirited defense of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, in reply to a carping reviewer in the *London Times*. We have not space here to discuss the theological opinions of Robertson. He is suggestive and inspiring, even where his statements are defective and partly erroneous.

LIFE OF DR. VAN DER PALM.*—If any of our readers would like to know what sort of a man is a veritable Dutch divine of the nineteenth century, how he lived and how he preached, we advise them to procure this book, to read this biography, including the stately Latin of the appendix, and to ponder over these sermons. It breathes the very atmosphere of Leyden. We seem, when we read it, to see the stately doctor in the lecture room, in the pulpit, in his home, and walking the streets—formal, learned, eloquent, affectionate, pious, and *Dutch*. The Latin address to his pupils after the death of a favorite son,—the learned opinion of Dr. Van Kaathoven, respecting his constitution, his sickness, and death, are in perfect keeping, and remind us of the days of the famous old times in the university of Leyden. In all these respects the work is quite unique and is worth an attentive perusal. Aside from these features, it gives us the picture of a faithful and devout Christian preacher. We commend the volume to our readers as a

* *Life and Character of J. H. Van der Palm, D. D.*, Professor of Oriental Languages and Antiquities, also of Sacred Poetry and Eloquence in the University of Leyden. Sketched by NICHOLAS BERTA, D. D. Translated from the Dutch by J. P. WESTERVELT. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865. \$2. 12mo. pp. 401.

gem of Christian biography, unique and interesting in both form and matter.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MR. AMBROSE'S LETTERS ON THE REBELLION.*—This small but most timely and able volume, comprises ten letters contributed to the *National Intelligencer* during the Rebellion, over the *Nom de plume* of Paul Ambrose. To these are added a short letter by way of conclusion, entitled Peace. The first letter was written January, 1863. They contain by far the ablest exhibition of the causes and the early movements which led to the war which we have seen. This exhibition is altogether the more valuable because it is condensed and temperate. There is no heat of manner and no violence of denunciation. The author simply records opinions, expectations, plans, and events, which were known to himself, or for the truth of which he has decisive evidence. The treatment of the subject is admirably simple. Indeed, it is a matter of wonder that the author should have been able to confine himself to so few facts and considerations where so many were pressing upon his attention, and were clamoring for utterance. It is more marvelous, still, that he should have been able to suppress all violence of feeling, when the occasions for the indulgence and expressions of it were so frequent.

As an argument against the movement of the South, whether the ground of justification was the rightfulness of "secession," the justifiableness of "revolution," or the necessity of "rebellion," it is unanswerable. The value and usefulness of these letters have not ceased with the conclusion of the war. We could wish that hundreds and thousands of copies might be circulated at the South. They could not fail to be useful now that the history of the war is reviewed in the light of sober reflection. Might not the "Southern Aid Society" do efficient service by sending it freely through the field of their labors?

MR. BUCHANAN'S ADMINISTRATION ON THE EVE OF THE REBELLION.†—In entire contrast with Mr. Ambrose's letters is the de-

* *Mr. Ambrose's Letters on the Rebellion.* By JOHN P. KENNEDY. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865. 24mo. pp. 246. New Haven: T. H. Pease. \$1.50.

† *Mr. Buchanan's Administration on the Eve of the Rebellion.* New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 296. New Haven: H. C. Peck. Price \$2.50

fense of "Mr. Buchanan's administration," by Mr. Buchanan himself. That Mr. Buchanan is the author would be evident if it were not avowed. Indeed, no other human being is capable of writing such a production. Smooth, specious, apparently logical, deprecatory of harsh judgment from man, and solemnly appealing to Heaven, the accused proceeds to demonstrate that he could have done nothing more to avert the crisis than he in fact performed. The crisis was inevitable, for had not Helper prophesied it in that dreadful book called "The Impending Crisis;" and had not Seward declared that an "irrepressible conflict" had begun; and did not John Brown invade Virginia with five white men and seventeen negroes; and is it not in the nature of fanaticism never to go backward? Moreover, did not the heresy of secession originate in New England; and was not Calhoun provoked to adopt the doctrine by the tariff so unrighteously imposed upon the South by the Anti-Democratic Party?

When Mr. Lincoln was elected, was not Mr. Buchanan rendered impotent to save and defend the country by the failure of Congress to provide him with either men or money? Was not the South encouraged to secede by the editor of the New York Tribune, and by General Scott himself? Would not Mr. Buchanan have gladly relieved Major Anderson, had there been troops in sufficient force at his command? In short, did he not do his utmost to avert the crisis and to save the nation? This is no joke, nor series of jokes, but serious argument, as we read this volume! Grant the premises which the writer lays down, and the conclusion is inevitable. Admit the facts which he recites, and admit that there are no other facts, which might have been, but were not adduced, and the case is made out.

The most material of these facts that are omitted is the fundamental and all comprehensive one, that Mr. Buchanan allowed the leaders of his party to assure the South of the practical sympathy of their adherents at the North, whatever they might do or dare. After the acts of secession were passed, and Fort Sumter was a beleaguered fortress, and negotiations were attempted between the real government of the country and the insurgents, the South was encouraged by the confident expectation that it had only to persevere, and help would come in the way of compromise. We do not assert that Mr. Buchanan was the medium through which such assurances were conveyed, but we do assert that to the right

understanding of "the history of Mr. Buchanan's administration on the Eve of the Rebellion," the fact that there was on the part of the South a confident reliance upon the sympathy and assistance of the friends of Mr. Buchanan at the North is quite as material as were the vagaries of Mr. Greeley and of General Scott.

Mr. Buchanan gives his tacit confirmation of the truth of these expectations by the bitter complaints which he makes that the requisite compromises were not proffered through the impracticability of the leaders of the Republican party. He omits to mention that the Democratic party itself failed to fulfill the pledge of its leaders when the crisis arrived, and the bombardment of Fort Sumter fired the Northern as well as the Southern heart.

It is hard to resist the refrain that is ever recurring in this appeal to our charity, "Pity the sorrows of a poor old man;" but we have no room for pity to the man whose connivance with evil precipitated the rebellion, and whose very argument for our charity so disingenuously suppresses the truth.

PERRY'S ELEMENTS OF POLITICAL ECONOMY.*—This is a neatly prepared text-book in Political Economy, which seems, also, well adapted to be used as a manual for the general reader. The method seems to us to be very good, and the handling of the proverbially abstract and difficult conceptions with which this science

concerned, to be uncommonly successful. The author aims to give a clear understanding of the subject-matter, by starting from ground which is familiar to every reader and ascending by easy steps to that which is more recondite and obscure. His style is familiar, sometimes colloquial to excess, but usually sufficiently elevated. It is not diffuse nor rhetorical—falling into no weakness of this kind, but is compact, direct, and manly. The illustrations are ample, and are drawn from sources that are intelligible and interesting. He does not fear to apply the results of his theories to matters with which we are most intimately concerned. He discusses commercial crises and explains the causes of the crises of 1837, '47, and '57,—of course upon his own theory. He discusses

* *Elements of Political Economy.* By ARTHUR LATHAM PERRY, Professor of Political Economy in Williams College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1886. 12mo. pp. 449. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.50.

Free Trade, and the principles of Protection, and reviews the Hamilton Tariff of 1789, the Calhoun Tariff of 1816, the Clay Tariff of 1824, the Tariff of Abominations of 1828, the Compromise Tariff of 1833, the Whig Tariff of 1842, the Walker Tariff of 1846, the Tariff of 1857, and the Morrill Tariff of 1861.

In all the portions of the book which we have read, he shows himself to be a clear, strong, bold, and generally sound thinker. It cannot be expected that within a science which is proverbially attenuated in its generalizations, allowing for manifold logomachies, as well as necessarily including a very wide range of variable elements as data for all its conclusions, all the doctrines of any single writer should meet with universal acceptance. We think, however, that Prof. Perry will not fail to earn the respect of those who differ from him.

PLAIN TALK ON FAMILIAR SUBJECTS.*—Dr. Holland is an indefatigable lay preacher. Whatever is his theme, he aims to be useful, and in this he is greatly to be praised. He also studies to be intelligible, and in this he succeeds better than many clerical preachers. He also seeks to know the condition of his audience. He aims first of all to be *en rapport* with them, to understand their prejudices, their want of culture, their false culture, and their pretended culture. He is thoroughly a man of the American people, and maintains a kind of dogged determination to remain such. He utters much commonplace, yet always with a certain measure of liveliness, some platitudes, yet uniformly with something redeeming in them. But he has the ear of large masses of men, and he aims to use his power over them for their good. In this volume he gives the public a series of his Popular Lectures, which having served their end in being often pronounced and heard, are now published to be read. The themes are Self-Help, Fashion, Work and Play, Working and Shirking, High Life and Low Life, The National Heart, Cost and Compensation, Art and Life, The Popular Lecture.

* *Plain Talk on Familiar Subjects.* A series of Popular Lectures. By J. G. HOLLAND. New York: C. Scribner & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 355. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$1.75.

METHOD OF PHILOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE.*
—We omitted in our last to notice this essay towards a plan or method for the grammatical and philological study of the English language. It is very cleverly done, and ought to be greeted most cordially by all who have at heart this very important but sadly neglected branch of study. It consists of a series of selections from Bunyan, Milton, Shakespeare, Spencer, and Chaucer, with a very copious list of questions at the foot of each page,—the answers to which are to be sought for in the books of reference whose titles are given. Prominent among these are the larger and abridged English grammars by Professor Fowler. We are sorry that we have no better grammars for philological uses than these, but we must be content with such as we have.

These exercises are progressive, being in the first place, grammatical, as are the extracts from Bunyan, and at last, phonetic, orthographic, historical, and critical of the text as in the extracts from Chaucer.

This is a very good beginning. The proper use to be made of it is to introduce it into schools and colleges. This will prepare the way for a more complete text-book; with more varied references.

A SUMMER IN SKYE.†—Since the days of Dr. Johnson and Boswell, there has not been much to turn the attention of the literary world to the island of Skye! But the mists have been lifted a little, and Skye has been visited once more! Mr. Alexander Smith,—once rather questionably known as “the poet,”—has written this very attractive book to tell us that the Cuchullins are still as wild and beautiful as ever, and that there is at least one corner of the British Islands yet left where there is a people living in true Gaelic simplicity. But the traveler who would verify his description, and see the country of the Isle-men in the light of Ossian must hasten his steps, for, as Mr. Smith says of the famous poems of Walter Scott, next year this volume will be “grated down into a guide book,” and Loch Snizort and Duntulme will

* *Method of Philological Study of the English Language.* By FRANCIS A. MARCH, Professor of the English Language, &c., in Fayette College, Easton, Pa. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1865. 18mo. pp. 118.

† *A Summer in Skye.* By ALEXANDER SMITH. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 16mo. pp. 423. New Haven: T. H. Pease. Price \$1.75.

be on exhibition to the whole world of tourists, and "the wilderness of Skye" will be a wilderness no longer. We should like to dwell longer on this charming volume, for it is "as full as an egg is of meat." We have been astonished as we have taken it up day after day to find how famous a place is Skye, and how much is going on in that far away island in which the world should take an interest!

THE FREEDMEN'S BOOK.*—This book is in every way significant of the new order of things! It is an attractive looking volume, of some literary pretensions, edited by Mrs. L. Maria Child, and brought out by one of the most respectable publishing houses in the United States. The contents compare favorably with the best books of miscellaneous reading which are prepared for people of a whiter skin. The volume is dedicated to "the loyal and brave Capt. Robert Small, the hero of the steamboat Planter." It is worthy of notice that eighteen of the articles here published are contributed by eleven persons of African descent.

BROWNELL'S WAR LYRICS.†—Here is a little volume which has at once placed *Henry Howard Brownell* in the very first rank of American lyrical poets! His lines are instinct with true impassioned poetic fire, and breathe the very spirit of that hour when Farragut in the maintop fought the battle of Mobile Bay. It is fitting that the heroic deeds of "the grand old chief" should be thus nobly sung by one who was with him in the terrible fight of the River and the Bay. We quote from "the Fight in Mobile-Bay."

But ah! the pluck of the crew!
Had you stood on that deck of ours,
You had seen what men may do.

Still as the fray grew louder,
Boldly they worked and well;
Steadily came the powder,
And steadily came the shell,

* *The Freedmen's Book*. By MRS. L. MARIA CHILD. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 277. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

† *War Lyrics: and other poems*. By HENRY HOWARD BROWNELL. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 16mo. pp. 243. New Haven: T. H. Pease. Price \$1.50.

And if tackle or truck found hurt,
Quickly they cleared the wreck ;
And the dead were laid to port,
All a-row on our deck.

Never a nerve that failed,
Never a cheek that paled,

* * * * *

And now as we looked ahead,
All for'ard, the long white deck
Was growing a strange dull red ;
But soon, as once and again
Fore and aft we sped,
(The firing to guide or check,)
You could hardly choose but tread
On the ghastly human wreck,
(Dreadful gobbet and shred
That a minute ago were men!)

Red from mainmast to blits !
Red, on bulwark and wale—
Red, by combing and hatch—
Red, o'er netting and rail !

And ever, with steady con
The ship forged slowly by—
And ever the crew fought on,
And their cheers rang loud and high.

Grand was the sight to see
How by their guns they stood,
Right in front of our dead,
Fighting square abreast.

* * * * *

Ended the mighty noise,
Thunder of forts and ships,
Down we went to the hold—
O, our dear dying boys !

How we pressed their poor brave lips
(Ah, so pallid and cold !)
And held their hands to the last,
(Those that had hands to hold.)

* * * * *

There are over thirty of these "War-Lyrics," besides a larger number of "Miscellaneous Pieces," some of which are of a humorous character. Of this latter kind, one of the best describes the uncomfortable feelings of a sea-sick "Parsinger" on a "Californy Steamer."

"None of 'em seem to keer 6½ cents
How bad a feller may feel,
Nur to talk to him—not even the saler
Foolin away his time on a wheel!"

MRS. BARRETT'S POEMS.*—Mrs. Barrett was the wife of Capt. Charles H. Barrett, who graduated at Yale College in 1852. She died of Asiatic cholera on board the merchant-ship which her husband commanded, on the voyage between Hong Kong and Shanghai, July 13th, 1863. This beautiful volume contains a collection of Mrs. Barrett's poems, some of which were originally published in the New Haven newspapers. An interesting account of her life, written by the Rev. S. Dryden Phelps, D. D., serves as a very appropriate introduction.

WINIFRED BERTRAM.†—We have just received at the last moment before going to press another volume which comes from the popular authoress of the "Schonberg-Cotta Family," and the "Diary of Kitty Trevelyman." The publisher is Mr. M. W. Dodd, of New York City, whose American editions of her works,—as the authoress in a card informs the readers of her books,—“alone” have her “sanction.”

EVERY SATURDAY.—Messrs. Ticknor & Fields of Boston, the well known publishers of *The Atlantic*, and *The North American Review*, announce that on Saturday, Jan. 6th, 1866, they will begin the publication of a weekly journal, with the title which we have given above, which will be devoted to “choice reading selected from foreign current literature.”

This new magazine is intended for Town and Country, for the Fireside, the Seaside, the Railway, and the Steamboat. Its plan embraces Incidents of Travel and Adventure, Essays Critical and Descriptive, Serial Tales, Short Stories,

* *The Poems of Elizabeth G. Barber Barrett*.—New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo. pp. 453. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.

† *Winifred Bertram*: and the World she lived in. By the author of the "Schonberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd, 506 Broadway. 1866. 12mo. pp. 479. New Haven: F. T. Jarman. Price \$1.75.

Poems, Biographies, Literary intelligence, etc., in connection with judicious selections from the admirable popular papers on Science which are constantly appearing in foreign periodicals."

Every Saturday "is to contain each week thirty-two large octavo pages, handsomely printed in double columns, with an engraved title."

Terms.—Single Numbers, 10 cents. Subscription Price, \$5.00 per year, in advance. MONTHLY PARTS will be issued containing 128 pages each, handsomely bound in attractive cover, price 50 cents. Subscription price, \$5.00 per year in advance.

Clubbing Arrangement.—Subscribers to any of the other Periodicals published by Ticknor and Fields will receive *Every Saturday* for \$4.00 per year in advance.

Messrs. Ticknor and Fields, it will be remembered, are also the publishers of *Our Young Folks*. This magazine, so full of interest to children, reached during the first half year of its existence a circulation of over fifty thousand! The publishers announce that during the coming year (1866) they hope to make the magazine still more attractive and valuable.

NEW PUBLICATIONS OF MESSRS. SEVER AND FRANCIS OF CAMBRIDGE, MASS.—*The Ballad Book*. Selection of the Choicest British Ballads. Edited by WILLIAM ALLINGHAM, Author of "Day and Night Songs," etc. 18mo. 1866. pp. 397.

The Sunday Book of Poetry.—Selected and arranged by C. F. ALEXANDER, author of Hymns for Little Children, etc. 18mo. pp. 335.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

The Poems of Thomas Bailey Aldrich. Ticknor & Fields. Blue and Gold. 24mo. pp. 240.

Golden Heired Gertrude. A Story for Children. By THEODORE TILTON. With Illustrations by H. L. STEPHENS. New York: Tibbals & Whiting. Small quarto. pp. 40.

Chastelard. A Tragedy. By ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo. pp. 178.

Vital Godliness.—A treatise on experimental and practical piety. By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D. D., LL. D. American Tract Society. 12mo. pp. 610. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

John Vine Hall; or Hope for the Hopeless. An autobiography edited by his son, Rev. NEWMAN HALL, of Surrey Chapel, London. 12mo. pp. 264. American Tract Society, New York. Price 60 cents. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

Analysis of Darwin, Huxley, and Lyell; Being a critical examination of the views of these authors in regard to the origin and antiquity of man. By HENRY A. DuBOIS, M. D., LL. D. Republication from the "American Quarterly Church Review." 1866. 8vo. pp. 94.

A Brief Memoir of Rev. Giles Firman,—one of the ejected ministers of 1663. By JOHN WARD DEAN, Vice President of the Prince Society. Boston: 1866. pp. 16.

T H E

NEW ENGLANDER.

No. XCV.

A P R I L, 1866.

ARTICLE I.—THE NEW ERA.

Magnus seclorum nascitur ordo. Such is the impression even upon heathen minds, when society has been unhinged and overturned, when a state of seemingly permanent order has succeeded the years of revolution. Such still more is the conviction of Christian minds when great principles of justice have triumphed in a contest which was forced upon a nation, when the question is finally settled whether flagrant wrong could be met in its proud and grasping course, and be overthrown while yet there is hope, or must sweep onward to utter national ruin. This Christian conviction, or hope—if it be only a hope,—is an authorized one. It is built on a faith in a divine plan, and in a progress dependent, not on inevitable law, but on the counsels which originated the system and sent the Son of God into the world. It has thus a Scriptural foundation; but more than that, the prophetic teaching of the Old Testament, and of the New, present the world to us as a battle field between good and evil, and the leading conflicts of the world as the steps forward, in preparation for the final establishment of the Kingdom of Heaven.

The great events in this land since 1861 have been looked upon by Christian minds as the crisis which was to deter-

mine our whole future history, as the crucible in which our national character was undergoing the purifying fires. Why was this view entertained? Not because the war grew into such immense proportions, for great wars lasting longer and costing more blood, have had comparatively small results. The thirty years war of the seventeenth century in Germany, with its ten millions of lives sacrificed, and its multitude of villages desolated, did indeed bring about a compromise of hostile religions and baffled the Emperor's hope that he might again lay the foundation of a truly imperial power; but how little good after all was wrought by it for society, or for religion! So the seven years war of the next century destroyed, as it is said, a million of lives, and ended in securing to Frederick the Great a province, of which he was by treaty master when the war began. And vast as were the French wars from the Revolution to the downfall of Napoleon, their effects were rather negative and destructive than positively salutary, and at the last, without solving the problem of society and government in France, they ended in a reaction which Europe still feels to its very core.

Not the magnitude of our late struggle then, nor the principle of self-preservation with which it was waged at first, but the issues into which we were forced by divine providence in spite of ourselves—issues which at the opening of the war only a small part of the North would have accepted—constitute the importance of this war and inaugurate a *new era* in the history of the United States and of mankind. Most wars, if they do not end in loss or mutual exhaustion, gain but a few of the objects for which they were undertaken, but this, being a strife of principles, has wrought mightier changes in society and government than we dared to hope. It began in self-preservation, it ended in the solution of a problem which no skill of ours could unravel beforehand, and in regard to which a devout mind can only cry "what hath God wrought!"

The new era is ushered in by the overthrow of slavery and of secession,—the motive and the doctrine of the rebellion. The first, by the admission of all thinking persons had met its fate before the constitutional amendment rendering it an impossible thing wherever the law of the Union is acknowledged, and

before the returning states had accepted its abolition as an inevitable fact. The other may be still sustained by the same arguments which multitudes at the South, and a few political "incurables" at the North, regarded five years ago as convincing. Possibly few of those who thought they were fighting and suffering for state rights will at once give up this favorite theory, which since the days of nullification in 1832, when in a milder shape nearly all the South condemned it, has been gaining by degrees a fearful power, and has thoroughly controlled the Southern mind. And possibly in the future there may be movements in discontented states on a small scale, which will justify themselves on a similar view of the Federal Union. But after all, secession is extinct and can never be raised to life again. Its animating principle, the motive from which it drew its power, being itself given up, can never again quicken the dead corpse. Never again, it is probable, can a number of contiguous states adopt this doctrine as a pretext for resistance to the general government. The immense love of the Union, which secession first revealed to us, will, as long as the memory of the years of strife shall live, or its history be preserved, prevent similar appeals to such an *ultima ratio* of disaffected states. The absurdity of secession, as a practical principle, needed only the experience of the Southern Confederacy to place it in the strongest light, for what security was there to this new Union, or at what moment could not any one of the States break away from the covenant. And the right so to do they were obliged to admit, only qualifying it by the important addition that such new secession would be the cause of war. Why then had there not been a good cause of war on the part of the Northern States? Thus secession is stripped of its pretext, it has been conquered, it has been denounced, it is shown to be self-destructive, and a mean name adopted to cover up a revolution. And, so, henceforth the old arguments so often urged since the forming of the constitution, to the effect that it secured its own permanence, that no power of a state or a cluster of states could dissolve it, that United States law is supreme everywhere,—such arguments as these urged by Jackson, by Webster, and others without number, besides their old cogency, have gained a new and vast power from the

experience through which the country has passed. Separation or secession now not only means wrong but also an inheritance of war through generations, a destruction of our highest hopes, a violation of the highest principle of our institutions.

The new era resting on such foundations,—on the abolition of slavery, on the rejection of the right of secession, which are not temporary, but permanent, which are not superficial but deep seated—must be permanent itself. There is no going backward. There is no evading the force of the new events by any political folly, all powerful as political folly sometimes seems. Even those political moles, the demagogues, must discover, and are beginning to discover, that the old issues and the old compromises are a story of the past, that the precedents of the worst days of the republic can be applied successfully no longer. Even those men of one idea, the conservatives of form rather than of spirit, must ere long see that the world moves. Even Southern ministers will by and by give up the argument from Noah's curse on Ham, from Hagar and Onesimus; indeed we anticipate that some persons still living may see the time when two or three gray headed men, too old to learn, too isolated to do harm, shall be pointed at as the last advocates of the peculiar doctrines of the "Church South."

There is then a natural exultation in every thinking mind, and a hopeful looking forward, when we take into account that a malady of the body politic that seemed incurable has been cured, that a stormy cape has been doubled without foundering or shipwreck. We have a right to rejoice and to rejoice in hope. We may hope on the same ground on which the Christian may hope, as he reviews his experience,—that he who has begun a good work in us will carry it on, until the kingdom of Christ shall be completely established within our borders and through the world. And this hope may infuse strength into every endeavor to act worthily of the times; it may and must put new power into all Christian movements, and may help us to become alive to a new sense of responsibility.

But danger goes along with hope, and new dangers as well as new possibilities of good attend on the beginning of a new era. The Israelites had a right to exult when they had crossed the Red Sea, because Jehovah had "triumphed glo-

tionally," and they had a right to hope that he would "bring them in and plant them in the mountain of his inheritance." But as they wandered forty years in the wilderness for their sins, so the speed or the slowness of our course henceforth, before we can become that thoroughly Christian nation which can secure and retain prosperity, depend on our conduct, on being aware of our dangers, on perceiving what we can and ought to aim at, on having the spirit to go steadily forward in the right path. The great deliverance God has wrought for us gives us possibilities of good only, and furnishes us with encouragement, but no more supersedes our working, or relieves our anxieties, than the providential rescue of a ship from foundering at sea ought to relieve the crew from all apprehensions during the remainder of the voyage. Let us look at the dangers and the risks, at the powers and the duties which the new era brings with it. Let us do this, without entering into political questions any more than is necessary in order to take a full view of the situation as from some Christian watchtower of far looking thought.

The first imagined danger we notice is suggested by the tremendous power exercised by the general government during the continuance of the war. The contrast especially between the imbecility of the former administration and the almost omnipresent efficiency of Mr. Lincoln's government, controlling railroads, telegraphs, newspapers, arresting men for disloyal utterances imputed to them, superseding civil by martial law and stationing its troops and officers in uninvasion districts,—such exhibitions of power, together with the impression produced by fleets and by armies so great as no American had ever dreamed of before, were enough to excite alarm lest the States should lose their old political standing, and a consolidated central power should introduce a movement towards an imperial despotism. But if some admired such a power as they admire the Napoleonic state, and if others would wish, for the sake of the conveniences of general intercourse, to entrust the central government with greater control over the avenues of communication and the currency, the danger of the growth of centralism is dispersed by the facts which have occurred since the war came to an end. The States are as strong

as they ever were. The general government has gone back into the track of peace. The limits of the constitution remain. Only it has been demonstrated for the security of future times, for the confidence of faint hearted patriots, for the dismay of the rebellious, that a government seemingly weak and half asleep in peace can grow into a fearful power in war, while, when the danger is past, the habits of peace will easily resume their sway. The government thus may be compared to a good-natured mastiff, hungry indeed and costly during the day, without seeming to pay for his keeping, but when night comes and the burglar is at his work, rousing the whole neighborhood by his barking and his onslaught upon the foes of society.

More real and far greater danger is to be apprehended from the rehabilitation of the disaffected States, and the opening to disloyal men of the avenues of political power. Here we must face an inevitable necessity—inevitable, because on the one hand the kind, unvindictive feelings of the triumphant North, and on the other, the prevalent doctrine of the status of the seceding States, will require that restoration with an energy not to be resisted or even long put off, and will require it probably before it can be set on foot with safety. It is impossible not to have the conviction that many of the representatives from the South will come to the legislative halls with the spirit of bitterness and disloyalty in their hearts, that they may lend themselves to disastrous compromises, that they may threaten and even attempt the repudiation of the national debt, that they may make demands for relief or compensation which will agitate and distract the country. What the exact effect of such movements would be more keen sighted prophets than ourselves must tell. But to us it appears pretty certain that the evils such men can do must be done soon or not at all; that five or ten years hence there will be no South, and no peculiarly Southern interests; that society there, having settled down into its permanent forms and being engaged in the peaceful pursuits of industry, will need security and quiet development; and that agitators, malicious or mercenary, will be regarded there, as well as here, by those who wield the influences of society, as its worst enemies.

It is indeed quite possible that attempts will be made, into

which Southern politicians will enter with zeal, to overthrow the present system of protection to American manufactures. May we be permitted to say that we should not look on such a movement with alarm, if it could carry its point by slow degrees without sacrificing the vast capital already invested in this interest, and if a considerable portion of the revenue, as now, could be raised from the duties on imported articles. The country, from the necessities of the war, is in a peculiar situation. Internal revenue, which was once a part of the democratic policy, is fastened upon us, while customs which waged battle against domestic taxation are equally a necessity. An honest nation is not likely to forego the power of raising the immense revenue required from both these sources. But at the same time we believe that the nation before many years will reject the protective system as false doctrine, and that the selfishness of the manufacturers will have to come to terms with the interests of the vast body of consumers.

But however this may be, it is not easy to discover any other sectional grounds of party divisions. We shall agree in the interpretation of the constitution, we shall feel ourselves bound together by common interests, and the minor differences of political doctrine will be just healthful and active enough to exercise a beneficial watchfulness over the proceedings of the party that happens to be predominant. What can there be to divide this country when slavery and secession with their immediate results have become matters of history! On the other hand there will be everything to unite; East and West will be bound together, West and South, North and South, by closer and vaster interests of business, by a greater assimilation of character and opinions, by more numerous and important avenues of communications,—to say nothing of the dread of the evils of disunion on which four years of war have been reading a lesson never to be forgotten.

Another great danger, the gravity of which will be felt during the next decade more than ever afterwards, arises from the burden of the vast national debt. Will the nation be honest? Will demagogues, when the pressure for some temporary reason is heavier than usual, follow the example of the Mississippi demagogue, who is now a prisoner of state? Will our popu-

lar government in its measures express the conscientious convictions and enlightened views of the best, most industrious, and most heavily taxed classes, to whom the fulfillment of obligation is a vital thing, or the folly of those who, while they pay the least, have the least principle and the least inclination to pay that little.

The new era begins with a national debt of about one hundred dollars average charge on every man, woman, and child in the country, and the expenses of the general government, to say nothing of the vastly enlarged expenses of the States, will eat up not far from eight per cent. of the annual production. This debt cannot be made a national blessing, as the pamphleteer of Mr. Jay Cook, "general subscription agent of the government loans," tries to demonstrate; on the contrary, although like every safe investment it may do good and be used advantageously, it is the source of ramified evils, as all the political economists admit, and among them our Secretary of the Treasury of the Union. It is the burden taken on the shoulders of those who have not fallen in battle, the sacrifice necessary for our existence. Yet immense as the debt is, it *can*, and if we live honestly and peaceably, *will* be paid off, not indeed as easily as some sanguine calculators have proved to their own satisfaction—for the taxes themselves present an obstacle to increase of production and to accumulation of capital, while the throes of a return to specie payments must for a time injure the resources and facilities of the industrial classes;—but still it can be discharged with greater ease than the debt of any other nation on the globe, Great Britain not excepted. This is owing plainly to the great rate of increase of population, the greater rate of increase of production, the immense undeveloped resources of the territory, the vast number of property holders, and the wonderful activity of the people—to which we may add as a special cause the stimulus and sense of power generated in the Northern States by the war. Owing to these causes, taxes, and consequent increase in the price of productions, which now make incomes not more than two-thirds or a half as valuable as they were five years ago, will be far less felt by a larger and richer population in ten years, and in twenty years will cease to be a burden worthy of complaint. And if it be overconfi-

dent to expect that the nation will be out of debt in twenty years of peace, a cautious person will admit that the year 1900 may easily see every obligation of the government discharged.

But will the nation do what it can thus do in a comparatively short term of years, and with no very great strain after a short period of exertion? That there are persons in the North bad enough to advocate repudiation we admit, and many at the South would be glad to shake off taxes imposed for their subjugation. We believe, however, that this small minority of bad men will be powerless against the moral sense and the immense interests of the great mass. All the trading class, all the bankers, all who live on their incomes, every one who feels that national honor is essential to the prosperity of all, all who have anything to lose and who shrink back from general ruin, all who perceive that the claims of unpaid foreign bondholders must be in the end enforced by war—all these would cry out against a crime far worse than secession or rebellion. Its advocates, if any such should show themselves openly, would be disowned by every party. Still a few men without power or followers, only shameless enough to suggest such a measure as repudiation, might do vast mischief by impairing public credit; they might ally themselves with unprincipled money-brokers, in order to create a fall in the stocks, and take a part in the gains of fraudulent speculations. These are the men to be denounced, and, if possible, to be punished.

But supposing this danger to be passed by, the new era is to all appearance to commence an age of intense industrial activity. The United States have now reached that point in the progress of national industry, which the accumulations of capital are sufficient for almost any new and promising enterprise. In particular, the rapidity with which the resources of business have increased within the last one or two decades is utterly astonishing; the details of the last census in this respect would excite only incredulity, if the money power of the country had not burst forth into view during the war like a hidden fire. Boastful as we are without ground, we knew not what great things our savings and our industry had laid up and could accomplish. The war has added the stimulus of a new feeling of power, and new avenues and hopes of gain are opening on

every side. It is indeed likely, as we have suggested, that, as the return of specie payments draws nigh, credit will become cautious, and borrowers be cramped; but this can last for a few years only, and as for the ravages of war, a few seasons of profitable work will make them good; for the largest part of the capital in an industrious country is the fruit of a few previous years of labor. This new state of things is as full of danger as it is of promise. The intense energy of business must lead to inequalities of fortune greater than have ever been known before; the power to command capital in large masses must lead to frequent speculation; wealth will spend itself in luxury and pleasure; and the intellectual interests, as well as the intellectual tastes, of the nation will be apt to be overshadowed by the material. The probability of an age of great material prosperity, turning the aspirations of the hopeful and adventurous in the direction of gain, wealth, show, lavish expenditure, is not an omen of good for the culture, the morals, or the religion of the nation. A slow advance in wealth is better for these higher interests than a very rapid one. Simplicity of manners, contempt for show, moderate desires, the checks of necessary economy, are the true mine from which the ore of a refined national character is to be extracted.

In pointing out this danger to the higher and spiritual welfare of the land, we are led to the inquiry how the causes at work in the new era are likely to affect our civilization. The answer must be a conjectural one, but inasmuch as it will disclose what will be our true standing place and our highest duties, it may be useful, if not entirely worthy of reliance. And first, if the only effect of the last five years were to increase the intensity without changing some of the traits of the national character, we should be compelled to take a sombre view of the future. But we can hardly doubt that changes are at work which will show a better side of American life; that we are in an education which will train the nation up to something higher than money-making, shallow knowledge, boastfulness, and self-conceit. We can only give the most general outlines of these anticipated changes for the better. In regard to general education, twenty years of quiet, if granted to us, will initiate a system of common schools throughout all the South-

ern States, and the training at the North will be both more thorough in the elements of knowledge, and will provide special instructions in all the leading arts. The publication of books, there is no reason to doubt, will increase in a greater ratio than the population; the great extensive sales of standard works in late years cannot be accounted for merely by the fashion of possessing and exhibiting a library; there must be a greater proportion of readers of good books, more extensively diffused cultivation of taste, more of that knowledge at least that floats over the surface of things, and gives a reputation of superior attainments, than could be found twenty years ago; while the strides the West is taking in wealth and intelligence render it sure that the intellectual cravings of the newer States are increasing rapidly. Taste for the fine arts too is on the increase. It is true that the number of visitors to the galleries of Europe, the number of purchasers of statuary and painting prove little, since to many persons objects of art are part of the show of life, like a fine house or a fine coach, but we cannot help believing that there is a refinement and a spread of taste both in these arts and in the art of music. For a time, architecture was running into glare and showy imitation; nor have these vices become obsolete in the plans for public edifices any more than for private, yet there does seem to be a higher conception of what a building should be, nor are even the committees for erecting churches in rural parishes content with copying those deformities which were once scattered over the land.

From all that has been said on this point of general intelligence and taste, it is evident that they have been slowly growing for years; but the new era, it is probable, with its wealth, its spread of education, its stimulus, will much accelerate the growth.

Here we wish to call attention to one point in particular—to the spread of science and of those sciences which have the most to do with the national prosperity of the country. There is no doubt that these will be fostered for practical reasons, and even the avenues of gain that are open to men of scientific training will invite many into this field. Whether natural science will not overshadow historical and moral, and thus the balance of

discipline, so necessary for soundness of mind, for breadth and justness of views, for a healthy faith, be disturbed, may well be a matter of apprehension. Of this we may have occasion to speak in another place. We only add here that it is of the highest importance for education, for true refinement, for genuine civilization, that the sciences which have to do with material phenomena do not usurp the place which belongs to the more spiritual sciences ; that the tangible and visible do not take the place of the immaterial ; that the knowledge of things does not claim precedence of the quickening forces of nobler truth.

Indeed, as has been hinted, the new era will have to guard against one of the leading tendencies of the times—that of overvaluing the outward world. Our conquests are over the outward world, our discipline is likely to run more and more into this direction ; our money, accumulated by men incapable to a great extent of intellectual enjoyment, seeks outward gratification ; materialism in philosophy, in the indulgences of life, and in culture, will reign at the cost of religion, morals, and sound taste, unless the spiritual powers can continue and even increase their control over society.

And here we approach the most momentous of the inquiries connected with the new era, namely, what part religion is called to act ; what is to be in the coming years her chief line of effort. We will consider the aspects of the times in their relations to religious faith, and then in relation to religious practice.

The two great enemies of Christian faith in modern times are the materialistic and the pantheistic theories of the world. In the hands of these foes, the natural sciences, and history itself, with criticism as its ally, are made to turn their guns against revelation. In our country, hitherto, the naturalists have, to a considerable extent, been sincere believers in Christ, and even devout men, so that as we run over in thought the highest names in this field, we scarcely meet with one who can be called a sceptic or an infidel. So, too, nearly all the learning and the talent is with the theologians who defend both supernaturalism and inspiration ; those who have been trained in Germany, those who have studied the controversies there

waged of late years, on the origin of the Gospel, and on the nature of the Old Testament, are, almost without exception, standing on the old ground, to which Germany herself is coming back—although all of them, it is probable, can not exactly subscribe to the received views of inspiration. This is a fact full of encouragement; our scholars have drawn their final discipline from the land of rationalism and pantheism, without being essentially warped from the faith of their fathers. There are now among us accomplished theologians—not indeed in any great numbers, but far outnumbering the partisans of a contrary tendency—ready to defend the faith, familiar with the strongest arguments forged at Tübingen, who have perhaps conquered doubt themselves by honest research and devout prayer, and who can be helpful guides of younger minds.

But decided as the vantage ground of Christianity is, unbelief or scepticism has a secure foothold in the country. Theodore Parker seems to have vacillated between deism and pantheism, and was not the highest authority in exegetical investigations. Yet his influence has been large on the destructive side, aided as it was by the estimable points of his mind and character. More noticeable still are the intangible shapes of doubt which fill the air, so to speak, and betray a fashion of free-thinking on the part of the superficial and the ill-informed. You will see these somewhat vague symptoms in several descriptions of men, in the honest young mind that judges the Bible by the rules of a verbal inspiration, and finds itself surrounded by difficulties; in the newspaper editor or his correspondent from abroad, or the contributor to a popular magazine, who, with very little knowledge of the points at issue, sympathizes with unbelief, and covertly expresses his sympathy; in the popular lecturer, who, without intending to publish his rejection of the Scriptures, lays down principles that must lead him and his hearers, if they agree with him, into open infidelity; in the student of natural science, who is unable or indisposed to refute the objections which his studies have brought before his eyes. A great part of this doubt, at present, if not exactly honest doubt, is not inclined to cavil or to sneer. It rather half laments its own uncomfortable position, and sighs perhaps for the unquestioning faith of the Christian. It is moreover

coupled with more or less of admiration for the system of the Gospel and for the character of Christ; and it is so far from being self-indulgent or tending towards voluptuousness, that many who are its victims burn with indignation against public wrong, and are among the most jealous and benevolent defenders of the oppressed. Still it is to a great extent superficial, caught by contact with books that skim over the surface of things, and more a sort of fashion than a morbid spirit of scepticism. That such a turn of free-thought, if it should increase and descend among the more uneducated class, would degenerate in the end into bitter hostility to religion, can scarcely be questioned; and it certainly would then become, if unresisted, a most alarming foe of our faith, as well as throw a dark shade on the future welfare of the land.

We must expect then ere long to have in this land a repetition of the same contest that has been waged in Germany during the last three-quarters of a century, and is now in progress in England—which, in fact, surprised the defenders of the faith there while they were asleep, and before they were familiar with the new weapons of controversy. In Germany, the contest has so far gone through its phases, that we can now look to a triumph of Christian believers on the fields of history and of criticism. In England, the objections of natural science, the difficulties drawn from fixed laws of nature, in short the pantheistic or atheistic tone of thinking appears in the foreground, and the struggle is less between scholars, as is the case in the land of scholars, than on subjects open to popular understanding. With us, probably, the same characteristics of the controversy will present themselves to view, as in the English-speaking land across the sea. But come the contest assuredly will, and Christian divines, Christian laymen of intelligence, ought to be prepared for it. If it is to be a serious contest between honest doubters and confirmed believers, no evil except in individual cases will grow out of it. Some men's hearts will "fail for fear, and for looking after those things which shall come upon the earth;" but the result will be to establish the Kingdom of the Son of Man on a firmer basis. But to attain this result, preparation must be necessary. The student of Scripture, history, and criticism, the student of general his-

tory and civilization, the student of natural science, must be ready to meet the influences of unbelief which may be imported, and those assaults which may arise on our own soil.

If, however, the unbelief is to circulate through the less educated classes of the people, as we now find it among large numbers of the German emigrants, if it is to be flippant, vulgar, malignant, the cure here lies not so much in defending Christianity, as in getting a closer access to the class affected by the disease, and applying a more effectual remedy than heretofore. The Gospel itself brought home to its despisers, in love and power, must be its own witness.

And here we are brought to the benevolent efforts which the new era imposes on the representatives of the Christian faith—a topic which occupies many minds, which appears to all Christians full of importance, and which yet will not stand in the clearest light, until time and experiment disclose the avenues of successful effort. We can add little by what we have to say to what benevolent persons have thought and said already, yet we offer a few suggestions.

First of all, it is evident that the necessities of our own land will impose on us a greater relative burden than we ever before felt ourselves called upon to bear. The problem now is, to endeavor to occupy for Christ a country which is to take an amazing start in wealth, power, and vigor, which is to grow faster than ever within the next generation, to form within this period its character and to work out its destiny. The power of action, the work to be done, are offered to Christian people in such a measure as almost to overwhelm and confuse. To the duties of the war succeed the duties of entering every new field that the end of the war has opened. To do the new without neglecting the old offices of benevolence, to make equal progress with the swift advances of the country, lest Christianity come too late and find its work the harder, to leaven all parts of the land with the leaven of truth, to spread missions, churches, institutions of Christian learning, over a vastly larger space, to purify the greater centres of trade and wealth meanwhile at home—these are problems of most frightful magnitude, and which a people of less hope and vigor would shrink

from as impracticable. Yet, if a war so immense was carried through in four years, what need affright us !

Among the new tasks of great difficulty, is the attempt to protect, elevate, and enlighten those to whom emancipation has opened the door of citizenship. Here we abstain from all political considerations, as far as possible. We could have wished that suffrage could be given them on the same terms on which white men enjoy it—not as believers either in the right or the expediency of universal suffrage, but as hoping that a contest of races would thus be prevented, and a support for their newly acquired rights be secured. Yet the question is a practical one, and whether it shall be urged, depends on considerations such as these: Can it be forced on the returning States? Or, if forced as the price of their return, will it give the blacks any real protection among embittered whites, who look down on them as their inferiors? And will the attempt not prove abortive through the spirit which the North itself manifests, and so a reaction take place against the measures of the best part of the people? Ere these words shall have come before the eyes of our readers, probably the policy of the country will be settled. But however it shall be settled, those who liberated the blacks are greatly responsible for their future welfare—whether they shall have the avenues of knowledge open to them, whether they shall have an enthusiastic religion of feeling without morality, taught by most incompetent guides of their own, or a religion more like the thoughtful Gospel of Christ, whether they shall be free without using their liberty as a cloak of maliciousness. And in addition to these things, they must be looked after in their civil rights, and the laws that are to be made for their protection be faithfully applied, as far as possible: they must be shielded from dishonest state legislation, owning them to be free and treating them as slaves; they must be kept in quiet and peace, lest they give advantage to the worst part of society to harass them. How this advocacy of their cause, as citizens, is to be managed otherwise than on the floor of Congress and through the public press, we undertake not to say. But such protection is so necessary for their future elevation and religious welfare, that the movements of the benevolent will in great measure fail without it—

not to say that this is demanded by the safety of the land from the insurrections of a caste made free, and yet left a prey to the malevolent.

Another task, almost as new, and quite as imperative if it shall prove practicable, is the attempt to redeem the Southern States from the results of former social evils. We say, *if it shall prove practicable*, for it is possible that an obstinate, ineradicable pride and hatred may close up a large part of the South to the efforts of Northern Christians, and above all of New Englanders. Our own prevailing opinion is, that the symptoms of such ill feeling are strongest now, and will gradually subside. We believe that the increasing influence of Union men who are now almost shut out of places of influence, the presence of emigrants with their thrift and capital, adding new value to land and reviving trade, the institution here and there of schools and seminaries of learning by benevolent Northerners, in order to repair the destructions of war, gradually returning prosperity, the retirement of the most disaffected, the participation of the South again in the national councils, according to their fair share of public offices—that these and like influences will soften asperities of feeling, will make men cease to ask where their neighbor was born, and to measure friends and foes by difference of latitude. The prospect is, that a very extensive emigration from the North and from Germany will pursue its silent course in the years to come, and will be one of the chief mediating and uniting powers between the parts of the country. It is, indeed, by no means certain that the emigration will always be of the best sort, or will not receive a Southern tone of feeling, from the prevalent state of opinion in their new homes; but it is certain that if they are large landholders, they will carry with them more sympathy for the poor whites than men of the same class in those States have felt in times past, and that, if they are small landholders, they will demand for themselves the same privileges of education which they left in their places of nativity, and will generally not be content without the blessings of a thoughtful, earnest religion. And we have the strongest hopes that the intelligent men of the South, as they cast their eyes over the new state of things, will feel that there is but one way of bring-

ing the country formerly burnt over by slavery to a level of intelligence, wealth, power, quiet, and morality with the rest of the Union, the way, namely, of planting schools in every district, of reviving and improving the colleges, of founding churches, of giving aid to industry, especially to a greater division of employments in every practicable way. Blessings go with them, if they should move with all the heart in this noble work! Let them urge it forward, and not be ashamed of any offered aid! It is possible in the course of time so to change the aspect of things, that the war, as they shall look upon it, will seem a messenger of God, bringing with temporary chastisement ultimate salvation. It is possible that years hence, the best, the richest part of the United States will be those which the war has most impoverished; that they who have been chastised most will be blest most; that the States south of the Potomac will be the brightest stars in our constellation.

The present religious condition of the South under their old ministers, who have been most active in preaching secession, and who still with a warped conscience persist in their opinions, must be confessed to be none of the most hopeful. Who will deny that there are sincerely Christian men among these ministers? And yet these are the bitterest of their class, the most persistent, the most unreasonable, the most inclined to preserve their isolated position. How shall these Southern Christians be treated? Not as one church has already treated them, as if to gain proselytes and to extend its borders on the easiest terms, by saying nothing of the past, by requiring no recantation of schism or rebellion. That may be a way of thriving after a worldly sort, but it surely indicates a low tone of feeling in those who can thus forgive without acknowledgment of wrong, and restore without doing honor to the great principles of righteousness. And what is it likely that these Southern Christians will do? We have already expressed the opinion that the force of things will drive them from the position of a secession church; they will not in their various schisms repeat the follies of the English Jacobites, who, with more ground for separation, dragged out a feeble existence until they passed into utter oblivion, and their last bishop, if we remember aright, died a country practitioner of medicine. The

probability is that some compromise will be effected, depending for its stringency on the loyalty and the upright Christianity of the bodies from which they were divorced. Nor is it improbable that the two Methodist bodies, whose separation was earlier, will be again united. But what is the chance of gaining a foothold in the South for other denominations, which were unrepresented there before the war? Can the system of polity advocated in this Journal hope to prosper there? An affirmative answer cannot be given with any assurance. Present appearances are against it. As long as settlers and merchants from the North find themselves in an uncomfortable position in that quarter of the country, wrath and distrust will be eminently called forth by churches after a New England pattern; and yet, in the large towns and wherever compact settlements of Northern men shall be found, they may be introduced with success. This, however, must be a work of slow degrees, rendered slower and more uncertain by the small number of the emigrants in most of their settlements, by the fact that they will for the most part find kindred denominations to a degree established in their neighborhood, and by the more unpropitious fact, that more of them will be actuated by mere love of gain than is the case with the emigrants to the West.

Turning from this uncertain and somewhat sad prospect to the boundless West, that great section of our country, which poured forth its tide of armed men for the safety of the Union, we find there a more cheering view. First of all, we cannot but hope that the war has there peculiarly called forth a certain nobility of character, a generous enthusiasm, which may be turned in the direction of the Kingdom of Christ. Next, there is a real and rapid growth of religious power in that quarter, especially among the Congregationalists. Then the pecuniary condition is far stronger than it has been. The States to the east of the Mississippi are able to help the Atlantic States in sending knowledge and religion beyond that "flood," through all the newly formed States and mining territories to the Pacific coast. This vast field is open to us in the Providence of God, with no obstructions which Christian zeal cannot surmount. Obstacles indeed of a formidable character present themselves, such as pertain to every sparse settlement, and such

especially as belong to the general recklessness and worthlessness of miners; but it is a comfort to think that these mining colonies put on their worst aspect first, that every blow struck among them by Christian wisdom tells something for the Kingdom of Christ. This immense field then is a hopeful one. The old West is destined to make rapid strides in knowledge and religion: the new West, destitute as it is, will not reject the laborer for Christ, but rather invite him to work in all freedom and confidence. This is the principal sphere for the East and for the West—the East still urging forward that work in the nearer West which they long ago begun—the West aiding the East to penetrate into the regions beyond, which have lately become the white man's home.

The new era then seems to promise hard work, a struggle greater than any to which the Christians of the United States were ever before called. We must not neglect our old enterprises in foreign lands, for foreign missions have been the noblest fruit of American Christianity; but we must add to it another work that has played a second part hitherto, but is now become more vital than all others. And we must set about this new work not in the spirit of proselytism, not to spread Congregationalism for instance, but to spread the knowledge of Christ. Congregationalism has been eminently unsectarian in times past, almost carelessly so; it has been content to sow for others to reap; it has rejoiced if others have builded on its foundation; it has supplied the leaven for others to take and put into their separate baking troughs. It is not required to do so much as this, although this has been its preëminent and exclusive glory. Its motto has been "*sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.*" But it will be an evil day when it shall change its tone entirely. Let it provide for its own, and especially for those of its own house, but let it not go down into the arena of sectarian strife with *jure divino* claims, and a competition like that of merchants. Let it keep the Kingdom of God in its eye, as it has done in times past, and all men will honor it, whose honor is worth having.

In closing these thoughts on the dangers and duties of the new era, we revert to the great danger and the great source of hope. The great danger, beyond all others most to be dreaded,

is that from intense worldliness. The prosperity of the church is to be fearfully tried by the prosperity of all the gainful pursuits of life. Ostentation, expensiveness, self-indulgence, false estimates of life, with false tastes and the loss of simplicity of life, and their consequences, are more dangerous enemies to religion than secession and war. New York can do more harm in the new era than slaveholding did in that which passed away. And the worst of it is, that the evil influences of unbounded prosperity are insidious; they paralyze and stupefy; earth is made more attractive, and heavenly realities kept further off.

Shall we fall into or resist this evil influence? Shall we need great disasters to bring us back to our bearings? Who can prophesy what is to be the destiny of our land? But faith is better than prophecy. All the old arguments that God meant something great for us, and through us for himself—the seclusion of this virgin soil and this boundless continent, the character of the first settlers, the habits of self-government preparing for a broader freedom, the great revivals, the extinction of the French power that confined the colonies as within a wall of iron, the success of the Revolution, the immense growth of religion and knowledge—all these are eclipsed by what God hath wrought to introduce this new era. When our sins and the falseness of the government to its trust portended national decay, He punished, and in punishing saved us; He separated, and in separating united us; He called forth our energies; He made the slave-power its own executioner. He may have room to punish still, He may draw dark clouds around us again, but we will trust Him the more, for we see more of Him in our recent history. And as we believe that He has a progressive plan, we will enter into the work of the New ERA with faith and hope.

ARTICLE II.—SYSTEMATIC TRAINING FOR THE MINISTRY.

WHEN the late war with the Southern rebels broke out, there was a prevailing impression that it was only requisite to collect a host of men, put muskets in their hands, and hurry them into the field, and the rebellion would be speedily quelled. Persons who knew nothing of the military art were thought to be quite competent to head these untrained levies. In fact, study and experience in the grave business on which they were entering was thought by some to be rather a disadvantage than a qualification in those aspiring to command. Martial ardor must not be damped by the rules and traditional prejudices which were supposed to have sway in the military class. The bitter disgrace of Bull Run did something to open the eyes of men to the folly of such views. Yet one sapient editor, having sat for a day or two on the penitent's stool for his share in occasioning this mortifying rout, quickly fell from grace and signalized himself by setting up a cry, in the very midst of the terrible war, for the abolishing of the West Point Military Academy! Military training was so dire an evil, that the nation's great training-school of officers must be swept out of being, at the moment when skillful leaders were required for the salvation of the country! And the individual who raised this foolish cry was one who deemed himself competent to handle any subject, from the cultivation of a potato patch to the Trent case—though in his discussion of the latter question he did twice mention Lord Stowell *and* Sir William Scott as if they were two distinct persons! The nation learned by experience that although a trained general might be a poor one—witness McClellan—and a general trained elsewhere than in the regular schools might be a good one—witness Terry—yet the just presumption is not only that the officer who has received a military education is far superior to the novice, but also that the regular, prescribed course of education is likely to furnish the best leaders. Nobody laments that the management

of the war, instead of falling into the hands of Grant, and Sherman, and Sheridan, and Thomas, was not committed to Banks and Butler. To say nothing of common sense, the experience of the world ought to have saved our people from the costly error into which they fell. "One of the most certain lessons of all military history," says Arnold in his *Lectures on Modern History*, "although some writers have neglected, and some have even disputed it, is the superiority of discipline to enthusiasm. Much serious mischief has been done by an ignorance or disbelief of this truth." "While not even the most military nations can become good soldiers without discipline, yet with discipline the most unmilitary can be made efficient."

Now there is much to be learned from our late national experience. One great lesson is, that, generally speaking, training, discipline, special study, are indispensable to effective work in every department of action. Not all are fit for all things. Examples are found of individuals who have succeeded in complex and difficult professions, seemingly without the advantage of training, certainly without training through the established methods and instrumentalities. But it is fallacious to reason from exceptional cases. Because Dr. Franklin, when a boy, ran away, and afterwards stood before kings, it does not follow that fugitive lads are likely to attain the same distinction, as many who have imitated his example have ascertained to their cost. Rare natural gifts may now and then enable individuals to do what the generality of mankind in the same circumstances would be unable to effect. And where distinguished success is reached, apparently without the slow steps of preparatory discipline and study, it is often possible to see that a much higher and more beneficent success would have been attained, had thorough training been superadded to uncommon natural powers.

The general truth set forth in the preceding remarks, we propose to apply to the particular topic of preparation for the Gospel ministry. There is apt to be, even in enlightened communities, more or less of prejudice—prejudice which is sometimes latent—against the regular, systematic training of candidates for the pulpit and the pastoral office. This prejudice is built upon misconception and fallacious reasoning, and has

often been exposed. But some considerations bearing on the subject may be profitably advanced at the present time.

A minister is called to interpret the Bible and apply the truths of Christianity, in public discourses and more private instruction, to all classes of men. It is plain that he should be better acquainted with the Bible than the generality of those whom he undertakes to guide. He must be able to study, and must have already studied, the Book in the tongues in which it was written, with the aid of the various lights which critical investigations have provided for the learner. Without this qualification he is but an ignorant expositor of the sacred volume, perpetually at a loss to determine the meaning of its authors, unless indeed he is blessed with sufficient conceit to fancy that he can do by intuition that which patient study alone can accomplish.

But besides practice in exegesis and familiarity with the laws of interpretation, the minister must have attained to a systematic view of the contents of the Gospel. He must have become possessed of a definite, coherent idea of the message which he assumes to deliver. In what a hapless plight is the preacher placed who has no connected, consistent interpretation of Christianity, to underlie and regulate his teachings! He is to charge upon men their sinfulness, but he cannot tell what sin is; he is to summon them to repentance, but knows not what repentance involves; he is to direct them to believe in Christ, in order to be saved, but cannot answer the inquiry what "salvation" and what "believing in Christ" mean; he is to proclaim the Deliverer, but is at a loss to say what He has done or offers to do for mankind. He is, moreover, to solve difficulties, unravel perplexities, answer objections to the Christian system or to the evidences on which it depends, and to set forth the Gospel in a clear light before auditors, many of whom read and think on these high themes. It is evident that he is poorly equipped for this arduous task, which is here briefly sketched, if he has not gained a scientific apprehension of the Gospel system. The study of doctrinal theology, as a distinct branch, is then indispensable—the study of Christianity with a special aim at the accurate definition and harmonious combination of its doctrines.

But the minister is to be a minister of the *Church*. He is to labor in the Kingdom of God, the Divine State. And shall he know nothing of the history of that great spiritual Commonwealth, of its establishment, the divine protection and guidance which have attended its progress, of the development of Christian thought, and the phases of Christian life which have appeared in the series of ages intervening between the founding of the Church and the present? Shall History be acknowledged by all thinking men to be the true "*magistra vitæ*," and the preacher of Christianity alone be ignorant even of the history of the divinely established Community in which he is an officer? It is sufficient, some say, that he has the Bible. But what would be thought of a public man who imagined himself qualified for managing the country, with no other knowledge than he can derive from the Constitution, shutting his eyes to the earlier and later history of the Republic? He passes by the discussions of Marshall, and Story, and Webster; he knows nothing of the first planting of the country, of the races by which it was peopled, of the struggle of the Revolution, or of the annals of the government since. It is enough, in his opinion, that he has the Constitution. Would not every one answer that he can understand the Constitution a great deal better, if he will investigate the origin of the government, the views of the statesmen who have administered it and expounded its character, and especially if he will trace the actual workings of the Constitution, and follow the course and the growth of the Republic, of which it is the organic law? Of like value to the minister, is the thorough study of the introduction and propagation of the Christian faith in this world, of the rise of Church institutions and the mutations of polity, of the history of the profoundly interesting movement of the Christian mind of which theology was the product, and of the healthy forms and the mischievous corruptions of Christian life and worship.

But the preacher is to *preach*; and he is to be the pastor of the flock. The sound principles of rhetoric must be brought to his attention, and all meretricious and ineffective characteristics of style he must be taught to shun. The study of the structure of a discourse, and of the sermon as a particular form of discourse, cannot be superfluous to one who is to compose ser-

mons all his life. And the young may profitably listen to suggestions relative to pastoral duty, such as experience has suggested and common sense approves.

We have given a bare outline of a theological curriculum. To argue at length in favor of the utility of such a course of study is hardly needful for any who are not insensible to the value of knowledge. But there are mistakes which lead in certain quarters to the disesteem of theological training, and upon some of these we will briefly comment. It is thought sometimes that much study and learning impair the practical efficiency of a preacher. But experience proves the contrary. The most powerful preacher among the Apostles was he who had the most learning, and signs of whose peculiar type of culture appear on every page of his writings. The pulpit orator in the ancient church, who knew how to bring out the sense of the Scriptures in a way at once to instruct and move great auditories, was the educated and learned Chrysostom. Augustine was a trained grammarian and rhetorician, a student of the Latin orators and philosophers; at the same time that some of the leading *defects* in his theology are to be attributed to his ignorance of Hebrew and very imperfect acquaintance with the Greek. The greatest preacher of the middle ages, Bernard of Clairvaux, owed his power largely to his long continued, earnest study of the Scriptures. When we come down to the period of the Reformers, the foremost preacher was unquestionably Luther himself. And Luther had been an ardent and industrious student of theology. Augustine taught him evangelical truth and Occam sharpened his wits. Without his long training in theology, he would have been entirely incompetent to head the great movement. How would he have appeared in disputation with Eck and other Papal champions? He found out from Jerome that the so-called apocryphal books of the Old Testament were not in the Hebrew canon; and this is only a specimen of the numerous discoveries for which he was indebted to the early Fathers of the Church. But the point is, that with his discipline in theological study and his knowledge of theological writings, and partly by means of these advantages, he was able to stand before the people and declare the true doctrine with vastly augmented power. No preachers in

recent times have been more influential than John Wesley and his early associate Whitefield. Both were bred at the university. Wesley had studied the Greek Fathers, as well as leading writers in English theology. He recommended to his clergy to have on hand, for reading, some ancient treatise, which might give them good thoughts and at the same time keep their scholarship from growing rusty. His learning did not hinder him from being a zealous, moving, and highly successful preacher, and a preacher of this character to the poor. It were easy to multiply examples. The notion that intellectual cultivation is a disadvantage to a preacher who would have power with the people, is ill founded and is fully refuted by experience. The Church has suffered from the dullness and ignorance of her clergy, not from their excess of knowledge. Every real advance in the means of culture open to the clergy has been followed by a marked increase of their efficiency and their usefulness. Such was the result of Augustine's experiment of associating his clergy in a dwelling together, for study and mutual improvement. A like consequence ensued when Chrodegang, the Archbishop of Metz, a Prelate of the eighth century, following the example of Augustine and adopting the rule of Benedict, brought together his clergy in the canonical institute. The chapter of the cathedral,—that is the body of the clergy who daily, among other exercises, studied together a chapter of the Bible, and met for mutual edification—soon evinced, wherever the system was adopted, their superiority to the clergy who were deprived of this means of training. Sad abuses and corruptions afterwards came in; but such evils were owing to enforced celibacy and various other causes, and they prove nothing against the usefulness of systematical training for the ministry.

While we are speaking of the past, we are reminded of a frequent mistake respecting the influence of theology and theological discussions. It is often said that such discussions are barren of any useful result. Wrangling upon sacred themes, or the cultivation of theology according to a narrow method, where the enriching influence of scriptural and historical study is wanting, is doubtless attended with serious evils. Yet even this controversial temper may be better than a stagnant condition of the intellect, when no living interest is felt in re-

ligious enquiries. Scholasticism was marked, especially in its later stages, by striking faults; yet that intellectual movement was on the whole productive of great good. The dawn of scholasticism brought to an end the gloomy period between the breaking up of the empire of Charlemagne and the epoch of Hildebrand,—the only part of the medieval era that deserves to be called the dark ages. Scholasticism imparted to the mind of Europe a severe discipline without which no Revival of Learning would have been able to usher in our modern civilization. Scholasticism systematized the Roman Catholic theology, and thus exposed its elements of false doctrine in a form in which they could be confuted. Above all, the scholastic theology was the counterweight to the powerful tendencies to fanaticism and enthusiasm which prevailed in the middle ages, and which threatened to burn up with their unhealthy fire all rational religion. Gieseler has remarked on the happy providential circumstance that it was not left to the wild sects which at one time counted so great a body of adherents and mingled in their creed anti-Christian elements of doctrine, to effect the religious revolution in Europe, but this work was reserved for sober-minded, educated scholars and theologians. He justly observes that it was the schoolmen who not only rolled back the stream of infidelity flowing from the Arabian schools and from other quarters, but curbed, tempered, and balanced the mysticism and fanaticism which otherwise would have met with no barrier to their desolating progress. The great men of the thirteenth century ought never to be spoken of with disrespect.

But we are wandering too far into the past. What has just been said may stand for a hint that peril does not lie exclusively on the side of thought and speculation. Other tendencies are dormant in human nature which, to say the least, are attended with equal danger. The imagination and the passions, in the uneducated mind, are capable of being roused to a morbid activity upon matters relating to religion and the supernatural world. The modern delusion of "Spiritualism" with its multitude of votaries, chiefly from the half-educated classes, affords an impressive warning. It shows the danger of allowing anything to supplant sober reflection and reasoning.

There is a prejudice in some minds against dogmatic theology, which operates unfavorably to the cause of theological education. The vulgar idea that common sense and science are opposed to one another, is sometimes at the root of this hostile feeling. But there are those who oppose doctrinal or dogmatic theology on theoretical grounds. It is maintained that the object-matter—the truth of Christianity—is of such a nature that it cannot be accurately represented in language; or that language is of such a nature as to be incompetent to serve as a vehicle for accurately stating religious truth. Hence, it is inferred that definition and science in theology must be abjured. We regard this notion as groundless and futile. Language, though figurative in its origin, becomes a trustworthy, perfectly intelligible symbol of thought. The objection must come to this, that we can have no exact thought concerning the objects of faith. And the doctrine to which we refer is frequently stated in this form. It is said that insight, spiritual inspection is here the organ of apprehension, and that rational thought (as distinguished from that kind of perception) is here impossible. Now, we agree that no deep and living apprehension of Christianity can be obtained prior to experience. He that doeth the will of God shall know of the doctrine. However liable to misunderstanding and perversion the phrase may be, we yet believe that there is profound truth in the maxim of Augustine and Anselm, “credo ut intelligam.” The general tendencies of that philosophy of religion are sound. But then Anselm, and most of the great masters of theology before him and after him, believed in knowledge and science, as well as faith. They saw with equal clearness the truth of the other maxim, “fides quærit intellectum.” The understanding is to be met and satisfied. It is possible to reflect upon faith, to investigate its contents, to vindicate its rationality. They saw that knowledge was an efficient ally and aid to faith, besides answering a rightful demand of our intellectual nature. They gave heed to the Scriptural injunction, “Add to your faith knowledge.” Let us look at the question, for a moment, more closely. Definition in theology, it is pretended, is impracticable. We affirm, on the contrary, that Christian truth may be apprehended from another point of view, and in a dif-

ferent manner, than through an immediate practical experience, —admitting, however, that a spiritual experience is requisite. In other words, we affirm that scientific theology is possible. This is very different, of course, from contending that everything can be known, or that theological science is complete. The contrary position overlooks the practicability of two kinds of apprehension. Take an illustration. What is an *orange*? Now we assert that it is entirely possible to *define* an orange. It can be described as a fruit of a given genus and species, globular, or nearly so, yellow when ripe, covered by a rind, the inside having a certain construction, &c., &c. This is a real, objective definition. It tells what the orange is; it sets this particular product in its place in the kingdom of nature. "No!" says the objector—"you must gaze upon the fair fruit, you must take it in your hand, you must taste it and see how luscious it is,—otherwise you cannot *know* the orange." Does the naturalist then *know* the orange only as the child knows it who buys it and eats it at a fruit-stall? Is there no *science* possible in the case? Take another illustration. The man of science by mathematical reasoning arrives at the plan of the astronomical system. The stellar universe, the magnitude of the bodies that compose it, and the laws of their motion, are comprehended by him. Shall we be told that such knowledge is unreal and of no value, because a different sort of apprehension is given to him who goes out and gazes upon the starry heavens at night? Beyond the majesty and splendor that meet the eye, is there not a glory, also, in the hidden order that is disclosed to the man of science?

Dogmatic theology is a necessary, as well as a legitimate, product of Christian intelligence. The Church, in the early days of her history, was absolutely obliged to *define* the faith in opposition to a host of formidable errors that pressed for acceptance. Theology began as an indispensable means of self-defense against judaizing and gnostic heresies, in which elements of Christian truth were often ingeniously amalgamated with anti-Christian dogmas. We do not hesitate to say that if, between the year 80 and the year 180, theology had been deemed by the Church so hurtful and so fictitious a product as some confidently pronounce it, the Christian religion would have

been swamped in the deluge of heretical speculation which flowed in from every side. But it appears needless to argue for the right of theology to exist. They who decry theology, theologize with as much industry as their opponents. They define their opinions concerning sin, the Person of Christ, the Trinity, and the Atonement, discriminate between their own hypotheses and those of other thinkers, expect to be understood, and complain earnestly if they are not. Their example belies their own theory: and so it must, unless they leave off the attempt to state their opinions.

And if doctrinal theology is a legitimate branch of knowledge, the utility of it was never more obvious than at present. The enemies of Christianity are glad to take part in a crusade against theological science. Nothing suits their taste better than declamation against "dogmas." To sweep away definite statements of religious doctrine and to shroud religious truth in a haze, where nothing can be affirmed and nothing denied, and where friend and foe are indistinguishable, is a sure means of forwarding their ends. One of the most sagacious of the Unitarian divines, who belongs to the conservative school, and is held in universal respect, has lately remarked that the error of the present is generally not on the side of dogmatism; that exact statements in theology are the indispensable means of meeting the vague and cloudy utterances of a sentimental skepticism, and of holding fast to the essential principles of Theism, to say nothing of revealed truth. Men in the orthodox ranks who decry theology, casting their influence against the study of scientific divinity, are serving unawares the infidel party.

Another reason why systematic training for the ministry is held in low esteem by some, is the habit of undervaluing knowledge. In one sense, this is the best educated country in the world. Knowledge is more widely diffused than elsewhere. There are more people who *know something*, and more who possess a respectable stock of knowledge, than is true of any other land. At the same time, the educated class are, as a body, inferior in their attainments to the same class in several other nations. The prime defect of educated men in the different professions in this country, is the want of full and adequate

knowledge in the departments which they cultivate. One reason is the superficial and inaccurate manner in which early instruction is given in almost all the schools which undertake to prepare young men for college. A great part of the work which ought to be finished in these schools has to be done over again in college. Valuable years are lost by the slovenly teaching to which most of us are subject in the early period of life. There is no want of intellectual ability among us. There is no lack of intellectual activity. There is culture up to a certain level. But ample and thorough knowledge in any particular department is seldom met with. The observation holds good of the legal profession. The number of lawyers who can manage a cause which demands extensive reading or a real mastery of legal science is very small. Hundreds of young lawyers waste their time in petty politics or in doing nothing. The observation applies also to the medical profession. And the same is true, we regret to say, of the clergy. How few continue the earnest study of any branch of theology! How few are at home even in the interpretation of the New Testament! How often do preachers fail to seize on the exact meaning of the text on which they discourse! It is vain to plead, as an excuse, the want of time. These studies are in the direct line of professional activity. They directly aid the preacher in his office. And we are not departing, in these remarks, from our subject; for the present state of things proves the necessity of a training for ministers, which shall give them both the ability and the impulse to pursue their studies in the midst of their work.

There is a vulgar idea that extensive reading does not consist with originality of thought. That sort of reading which is called "cramming"—reading which is not digested or assimilated—does confuse and thus weaken the mind. But a thoughtful man is stimulated to more thought by books. Reading is to him a constant exertion of the intellect. In his mind, books are like fuel thrown into the fire. They make it blaze the more brightly. And wide reading delivers from a thousand errors and eccentricities into which able men are liable to fall. It does not quench originality, but it diminishes conceit, and gives a large, round-about view of a subject. The most precise thinkers, and they who have enlarged the boundaries of

knowledge, have been diligent readers. They have been enabled to mark the limit to which knowledge had already advanced, and from that, as a starting-point, to make new conquests.

We are strongly tempted to illustrate some of the preceding remarks by concrete examples. No theological writer has made more stir of late than Dr. Bushnell. We have often expressed our admiration of his genius, and our respect for his sincerity and independence. If we find fault, we do it unwillingly, and he will be little affected by our praise or dispraise. Dr. Bushnell found in the "Biblical Repository" a translation by Stuart of Schleiermacher's discussion of the Trinity. Schleiermacher thought himself unable philosophically to construe the personality of God. Hence, with marvelous ingenuity he constructed his theological system, from his first definition of piety to the close, avoiding the assertion of this cardinal doctrine. The wonder is that he wrought into his system so much of Christian truth, and was able to bring forward so frequently profound conceptions of the Gospel. But when he came to the Church doctrine of the Trinity, he found a somewhat unmanageable dogma. Hence, he revived the old Sabellian theory, and set it up in place of the orthodox doctrine. The Sabellian hypothesis wears a plausible appearance, as it seems to be an easy solution of a perplexing problem. But it will not bear the test of a fair and sound exegesis, nor does it accord better with the demands of philosophy—unless indeed philosophy runs into Pantheism. Dr. Bushnell, dissatisfied with the later New England hypothesis of a "three-fold distinction" in God, which Professor Stuart advocated, laid hold of the theory of Schleiermacher's essay and propounded it, with his accustomed fervor, in his book entitled "God in Christ." The clamor which that book excited, led him to read further on the subject, and he expressed himself in his second book, entitled "Christ in Theology," as not unfavorably disposed to the Nicene doctrine. Had his investigation been wider at the outset, he might, not improbably, have written a work in vindication of this doctrine. Fifteen centuries ago, the subject was canvassed in the Church by men of unsurpassed acuteness, to whom the Greek language

was vernacular, and who discussed the subject with intense earnestness, in the light both of philosophy and Scripture. Now we do not say that their conclusions are to be followed on this or any other subject; but we do say that their opinions and arguments cannot be safely neglected, unless Christian thought is to move in successive cycles, ever traveling over its own track. In his last work, on the Atonement, Dr. Bushnell ventures to say that Martin Luther at heart held, without knowing it, the doctrine of his treatise—that is, in one essential feature, the Roman Catholic doctrine of Justification! A better knowledge of Luther's writings would have precluded this patronizing but quite untenable judgment. Luther knew full well what he believed. A mind in which a few hints of Coleridge on the nature of the Will, the work of Christ, and other topics, have kindled so great a combustion,—how much greater things even might it not have achieved had it set a proper value upon the thinking of the past. The most popular preacher in the country is Henry Ward Beecher. He has preached for many years, with undiminished favor, to large assemblies which have been drawn together by the fascination of his eloquence. Beyond his oratorical power, but auxiliary to it, is uncommon fertility of imagination and uncommon ability as a thinker. His deficiencies are chiefly due to his want of theological knowledge. He occasionally sneers at theological science; but if he had more of it, his power of doing good would be doubled. Mr. Beecher found in "Phrenology" a classification of the capacities of the mind, which impressed him as being remarkable, as well as convenient. All the unphilosophical theories at the basis of this classification, we do not suppose that Mr. Beecher consciously accepts. Yet we have heard him, in a sermon that contained much valuable truth expressed in a pointed way, deny the doctrine of total depravity, and bring forward against it wretched, phrenological stuff about the diversity of faculties and the possibility that each may sin. Yet he preaches the doctrine of conversion, and if conversion is total—that is, the renunciation of one fundamental motive of action, and the adoption of an opposite one—then depravity is equally total. This is all that philosophical divines mean by "total depravity,"—that character, as to its radical principle, is

simple, and that no man can serve two masters at the same time. Mr. Beecher has done mischief by deriding doctrinal and metaphysical theology, when it is very evident that he needs nothing so much as a thorough study of that science, and a more extensive acquaintance with the best literature that belongs to it.

In older countries, crude attacks upon any branch of science make little impression. There is a numerous body of thoroughly educated persons who quickly put down such assailants. If a man comes forward to decry learning, he either fails to secure any notice, or is quickly silenced. But among us, all science and learning that reach beyond the most tangible uses may be made the subject of depreciating observations with comparative impunity.

Theological Seminaries are the training-schools for the clergy. The founders of New England showed their earnest desire to have a learned as well as pious ministry, by the self-sacrifice to which they submitted in order to secure to themselves and their posterity this inestimable good. They established Harvard and Yale mainly for that end. Seminaries are the development of this original design. The change in the course of college studies, by which little room was left for theology, rendered it necessary to found special schools of Divinity. At Yale, the Theological Department was avowedly an expansion of the means of theological instruction, which had been enjoyed from the first existence of the College. These schools should be liberally supported and fostered. There is little danger, the tendencies of American life being what they are, that they will send out pedants. There is far more danger that ranters will abound, than that the clergy will suffer from excessive erudition.

We agree that piety is the first qualification of a good minister. But theological seminaries may be nurseries of piety as well as seats of learning. If the student is taught to pursue his studies in a reverent feeling, with a constant eye to his future calling, his spirit will be chastened and purified by the contemplation of religious truth. Opportunities to do good in Sabbath schools and among the poor will not be wanting; and if these are improved, the effect will be salutary. Theological

students cannot be expected to have the feelings which are characteristic of a more advanced period of life, nor can they have the tempers of heart which only an experience of the work of the ministry can awaken. There are many students of whom it is true that their seminary course produced in them a deepening of the religious spirit. If one complains that he lost his piety in the seminary, it is safe to conclude that he had none when he entered it. This is good Calvinism, and good sense too.

Seminary training is sometimes thought to be unfavorable to mental independence. It is said that students imbibe a system of theology from their instructor instead of thinking for themselves. It is inevitable that young men should be influenced by the opinions of their teachers, and in many cases should be disposed to accept them with insufficient inquiry. But surely the evil cannot be greater than it was when the student lived with one minister, and never heard his doctrines called in question. This was the method of education before seminaries were established, and it was generally found, we believe, that the pupils of Dr. Emmons came out "Exercisers," and those of Dr. Burton "Tasters." And the student not only has a number of instructors, among whom it is fair to presume that there will be some diversity of theological opinion, but he also has the influence of his fellow students, and of their mutual conferences and discussions. The great remedy, however, for this acknowledged danger is found in the Biblical and historical studies which enter into the course. The student who is grounded in philology and practiced in exegesis, and who has taken a survey of the rise and progress of theology, and of the conflicting systems which at present exist, is provided with an antidote which in the end will prove effectual against the tendency to receive in a servile spirit the dogmas of his theological teacher. He will sooner or later bring everything to the test of the Scriptures, and he will be prevented from being carried away by a peculiar scheme of theology, for the reason that he does not know any other, or has heard no arguments except on one side.

As we implied above, a student at the beginning of his practical work will be likely to exhibit a certain rawness, which

nothing but actual contact with the various duties of a preacher and pastor will cause to disappear. This is no ground for surprise or complaint. It is inseparable from the position in which the learner stands, prior to the actual exercise of his calling. The cadet just from the military school finds war to be something new, and notwithstanding his study and practice of the art in the school, he is a different man after he has once been under fire. A little experience of real warfare sets everything in a different light. It does not, therefore, follow that his training is of no use, or that the system under which he has been educated was a poor one. The relation of theological education to ministerial life is somewhat analogous.

The usual course of study in our seminaries includes the substantial parts of a theological education. There is no room for essential alteration. The course may be capable of some improvement, but innovations ought not to be rashly made. There is one additional branch of study which might be advantageously introduced into our seminaries. We allude to "Biblical Theology," a discipline intermediate between Exegesis proper and Dogmatic Theology. It forms a part of the curriculum in many of the Continental universities. The work of Storr and Flatt, translated many years ago at Andover, is a work of this character. The development of Biblical ideas and truths within the Bible itself, is traced out, with a constant careful exegesis of particular passages under the appropriate rubrics. For example, the Scriptures are examined from beginning to end, to trace the gradually unfolding doctrine of the Immortality of the Soul; and so of other topics. It has been proposed to introduce into our seminaries lectureships on special subjects. Where a special subject requires for its treatment more time than can well be afforded in the established departments of study, and where an individual is found whose knowledge fits him to teach it, the curriculum may be amplified to admit such a lectureship. But some cautions are requisite. Generally speaking, Professors who devote their whole attention to a branch of science, and whose habits of life tend to cultivate a scientific spirit, are far better qualified to give instruction in their several departments than persons who are called in from abroad. There are certain evils which ought to

be most carefully eschewed in changes of the nature proposed. In the first place, nothing should be done to dilute and popularize the course of study. It should be severely scientific. Efforts to modify the studies of colleges and seminaries, which would tend to let down the character of the instruction in this respect, should be sternly withstood by all educated men. Diffuse, rhetorical harangues, such as might pass in Lyceums, would do more harm than good, and would soon become ineffably tedious. In the second place, persons who cultivate the physical sciences should not be called in to interpret Scripture. They have not the proper qualifications. They may be able on their own ground, but they are frequently weak and fanciful when they leave it, and undertake to expound the Pentateuch. When theologians are invited into scientific schools, to accommodate the supposed teachings of science to the statements of the Bible, it will then be time enough to consider the propriety of inviting the naturalists to reverse the process in the schools of theology. An educated theologian can, with little difficulty, acquaint himself with those conclusions of physical science having reference to Revelation which are really established, and find out, also, the litigated questions with the arguments of the conflicting parties. And he alone is qualified for Biblical criticism. In the third place, everything that savors of clap-trap should be avoided in arranging the course of instruction. There is not time for a great number of branches. It is folly to pretend to teach what cannot be taught well. And we are not satisfied that it is desirable to add a fourth year to the period of theological study. For some students, a fourth year is eminently desirable and useful; but for most, we are inclined to think that three years are long enough. The expectation that students will be prevented from going to Germany, by the addition of another year to the course at home, will prove to be mistaken. Those who desire to study in Europe, and have the means, will go there still. They who prefer not to go, or are prevented by some other cause, will generally begin their practical work at the expiration of three years. And, in the case of a majority of theological students, it is best that they should.

While we cherish conservative views in regard to the character

of theological education, we are alive to the importance of keeping the instruction in our seminaries abreast of the times. The tendencies of thought which are rife at present must not be suffered to escape attention. New phenomena in philosophical opinion continually require that a new aspect shall be given to theological teaching. Not a few ministers fall into the error of supposing that all things remain as they were, when they left the seminary, twenty, thirty, or forty years ago. In some cases they imagine themselves to be in close contact and intercourse with the world, when in reality the thinking class—and this class gradually leaven with their views the strata of society below them—have sailed away out of their sight. The shelves of their libraries contain the controversies of the last generation; but of the thoughts, the doubts, and the whole movement of the generation that has arisen since, they know but little. Now and then some disciple of Buckle, or Strauss, or Mill, in their own flock stirs them from their slumber, and awakens the uncomfortable suspicion that the world may have moved without their knowing it, and that their old sermons are no longer adapted to the inward questionings and wants of their hearers. Seminaries, through the new recruits which pass from them into the ranks of the ministry and through other channels of influence, may do much to prevent ministers from becoming fixed in the old ruts, and from parting company with the intellectual life of the age.

ARTICLE III.—A BIOGRAPHER AT WORK.

AN author who was about giving to the world the memoirs of a friend, not possessed of any singular claim upon public interest, gravely announced in the preface to his work that his friend was *par excellence* a biographer, and that, in his opinion, to have written a readable memoir constituted a sufficient reason why the author's own life should in turn be written. Prior wrote the life of Goldsmith and that of Burke; therefore, argues our author, it is proper that I should write the life of Prior, and, therefore, he was too modest to add, but surely too logical to deny, some day my life must be written. If this opinion is to be accepted, one shudders at the endless entail of biographies! Nevertheless, in full view of all the consequences, we propose to step into line, looking before and after like a wise man. We know a person who has written a biography, and we propose to write his life, but as we intend to account for so much of it only as was occupied in the biographic task, we rigidly demand of the biographer, whom by this act we entail upon ourself, that he shall preserve the same ratio, and write only that chapter of our memoirs which would cover the time spent in preparation of this essay. In this way we are most ingeniously reducing one line of biographic debt, and though it is metaphysically impossible that the score should ever be wholly wiped out, yet practically we are entailing only a pitiful and absurdly minute encumbrance upon the last comer, whenever he, shall appear. For observe, our friend wrote a life; we write so much of his life as wrote that; our biographer—for we cannot help ourself, modest as we are—will write a still smaller segment of our life; his biographer just sits down for ten minutes, say, writes a few lines, and is free by the contract; his biographer, again—we mean the biographer of this last biographer—does his part, *stans in uno pede* as it were, in the spare minute which every one can easily find in the course of his life, and with the happy consciousness of

having done his duty easily, he cheerfully submits to have his life taken for that minute, and leaves a memorandum to the effect. It is positively exhilarating to see this mountain of debt dwindling so fast to a grain of sand, and in the full glow of the encouraging prospect we begin our task, promising our readers and our future biographer to be as brief as possible, and promising our subject, for we must not forget that side of the obligation, that we shall be governed in the proportions of our Article, by a due regard for the time and labor which he expended on his hero.

It is not necessary to recount the circumstances which imposed the task upon him. Suffice it to say, that he found himself in some sort compelled to undertake a work from which he shrank, and for which he felt no special aptitude. He had used his pen somewhat in other kinds of literary labor, so that he was not wholly without confidence in attempting this; but the nature of the work made him draw back. He was called upon to write the life of one whom he had known intimately, had loved, and honored. His friend was not a person of public repute, whose life he would only need to sketch lightly, and the public would recognize the portrait, filling it in with their own impressions; he was intimately known only to a few, and not having left any published writings, indicative of his character, would inevitably soon be forgotten except by those few. The task, then, which the biographer assumed was to satisfy first his friends' associates, by a truthful record of the life which they had known with different degrees of intimacy, and next to present to outside people who might be approached, an interesting and complete account of one whom they never had known.

The question here arose—how far was the tone of the biography to be taken from that prevailing in the class with which it would be numbered? His friend had been distinctively a man of religious character and Christian enterprise. The biographer saw that it was amongst religious people that he must look chiefly for his readers, and among religious memoirs that his book would lie. But he felt a repugnance toward this class of literature; he had come to regard it as pervaded by an unhealthy tone; it seemed to him almost an inevitable charac-

teristic of religious memoirs that they should treat religion as an unlovely and unnatural element in life, almost in fact as a disease. There was a certain method in their dissection of the spirit, as if they wished to disprove Christ's words, and show that it was possible to tell, of one born of the Spirit, whence that Spirit came and whither it went. Those which recorded mainly religious aspirations and regrets seemed to him as senseless as ordinary biographies would be which should give as indications of life a daily memorandum of the condition of a man's lungs as tested by the stethoscope; and besides, how different these emotional expressions to the man himself, quick under some excitation, and the same expressions read years afterwards it may be by one unable to reproduce the ligaments which bound them to a living soul. "Is there not something unnatural," he once said to us, "in religious biography at all, as a distinctive class? Or ought not the distinction to be made a broad one, throwing all lives into two great classes, according as they do or do not spring from religious principle? Biography of scientific men, of literary men, of statesmen, of artisans there may be, lives even of eminent shoemakers, and, perhaps, according to a very recent school, lives of men who have once been boys; but religion is not an acquisition like scientific or political knowledge, nor is eminence in it analagous to eminence in some art or trade; it is vital, not accidental."

While we confessed to a common prejudice with our friend, we pointed out to him that there must be such a distinct class, since those who by reason of strong Christian purpose rise high above the level of ordinary Christian society are by this very exaltation *eminent* people, marked, attracting attention, and therefore such as the world wishes to know further about when they are dead, apart from any eminence which they may have attained in human pursuits; but that, in writing the lives of such men, biographers made the mistake of treating religion as an end to be attained, instead of a vital power at work in the soul. Indeed, we added, the very failure which you affirm of this class of writings demonstrates the high place in art which the class occupies. The easiest life to write is that which is most outward; a life of adventure is the lowest form of biography. The hardest life to write is that which demands a record because

of its strong character ; and the highest form of biography is that which undertakes to display character through a representation of those forms which in actual life best contain and exhibit it. And what order of character presents to the biographer more glorious opportunities and greater perplexities than that which displays a new force revolutionizing it? The meshes of a man's inner life are not easy to trace, and when the great Weaver is busy in weaving the excellent pattern of Christ, the task of tracing becomes more difficult.

Here let us digress for a moment to observe how excellent an opportunity exists for creating a class of religious works healthy, instructive, and yet very interesting—three desired elements which Sunday school librarians find it so hard to supply. If the writers of lives of religious men were to study for their task by writing novels, they would discover some valuable principles of the biographic art. The highest order of novels may be said to be that which creates men and women, and suffers their characters to work out their own destiny. There are surely but few general readers who cannot be won to the study of individual growth as gradually unfolded by the novelist's art. Why should not biography borrow the same aid, and taking the life of some person, quite unknown to fame, but having a strongly marked character, set forth the growth of that character under its changing experience of life, sketching with such fullness as need be the world of nature and society in which it moved, and showing how it was renewed and sanctified by Divine grace? Our biographies are too bald. We are told, perhaps, that the subject was born in New York ; and as many persons have been in New York, nothing more is said about the city. But why should not a little sketch be given of the city and city life, as seen behind the human figure? He goes to Yale, and that intense little world of which he becomes a force, attracting and attracted, is reduced to the merest shadow ; and so throughout the book—the hero is the only figure, and for want of more substance in the accompanying shadow, himself loses so much of his individuality as is the result of palpable connexion with men and things.

We did not at the time suggest this to our friend, but in planning his work he adopted some such theory, from a conviction that it was chiefly as a study of character that the life

which he was to write would possess any literary value or any influence. Among our friend's papers which have fallen to our use in preparing this sketch, we find this paragraph, copied from Carlyle's essay on Burns, and marked "This must be remembered if I ever have to write a biography":—"If an individual is really of consequence enough to have his life and character recorded for public remembrance, we have always been of opinion that the public ought to be made acquainted with all the inward springs and relations of his character. How did the world and man's life from his particular position represent themselves to his mind? How did coexisting circumstances modify him from without? How did he modify these from within? With what endeavors and what efficacy rule over them? With what resistance and what suffering sink under them? In one word, what and how produced was the effect of society on him? and what and how produced was his effect on society?" There is another note appended, evidently much later, judging from the color of the ink and the style of handwriting:—"Can one use the scalpel on his familiar friend?" He shrank instinctively from pursuing such a course with one whose death was still fresh in his memory. It requires no sacrifice of feeling to analyze most minutely the character of one's imaginary hero. There the intellect feels no restraint; but to grope about in the heart of a dead friend, no matter how pure one may feel it to be, creates a revulsion of feeling. Yet the analysis must be made, and happily for him, with his interest in psychology, there existed a continual restraint upon a mere prying intellectualism in the reverence which he felt for the dead, and the sense of his own inferiority in its presence.

The analysis must be made; yet it is not the highest art, and so our friend felt, merely to reproduce it in the same form. He must analyze, but the reader ought to be supplied as far as possible with the same material from which to form his own analysis; hence the aim of the biographer was to cast the life in his book in a structural form. He was obliged to tear down, in order that he might rebuild after the same pattern in miniature. Thus he analyzed the world about his subject, and selected representative forms which should as forms of art suit the requirements of his work, and as forms of nature suggest

to the reader's mind a multitude which could not be introduced, and which would be worse than useless if they were crowded into the story.

It was plain that the nicest care must be taken to preserve the proper proportion in this structure. The only rule which seemed applicable in determining it was to observe strictly not the accidental measure of time, but the real measure of growth. Stated in more general terms, the law would be, that having determined the central fact in the hero's life or character which renders him a proper subject for a memoir, the biographer should observe it as the integer by which his proportions are marshaled. Thus, in the present case, our friend determined that growth of character under the impelling force of a master purpose in life was such a fact, and accordingly gave most minutely that period of life which witnessed the awakening of the purpose, and its immediate antecedents and consequents. He saw that childhood, here as almost always, while it contained the character, contained it in a very limited sphere of expression, and that his chief care was to present the surrounding personages and circumstances which were to affect the early development, letting the child be projected from this back-ground only by such slight exhibitions of nature as one can make use of in describing a child's disposition; for while we get a very positive impression of a child's character from the numberless unguarded exhibitions of it, we are obliged to convey our impressions to others only through the most general terms; hence he aimed to let the child come forward a little into society, and display itself, not by words but by those movements and impulses which are emphatically more the language of children than of men. But upon leading his subject into a more self-dependent and isolated condition, he began to aim at more rounded expression, and to give circumstances more and more the task of defining and throwing into bolder relief the character projected from them, until at length the subject of the biography became almost a solitary figure, and externals were created only as he brought them into notice. In fact, beginning with chiseling a figure in basso relievo, our friend proceeded to execute it in alto relievo, and finally constructed a detached statue. In each period into which his hero's life might

properly be divided, he tried to picture him as he would seem to careful observers, seeing him then only, and avoided the anticipation of results even though they might give completeness to some partial sketch.

Nor was he unmindful of what may be called the proportions of breadth. It was quite as important that the various sides presented by character should be correctly adjusted, as that the progression should be studied, and nothing here could help but the watchful observance of the equilibrium of the nature which he was displaying. The proverb of an "inch to a man's nose," hinting at the fearful distortion which may result from the painter's incorrect eye, holds also in the case of biography, where mental features are more in danger of obliquity. The character, let us suppose, has its whimsical side; but if that be unduly dwelt upon, for the sake of making the general effect light and agreeable, the result may be to produce unjust contempt—so a cheerful mouth may, from the painter's over anxiety to preserve the cheerful lines, be made to express a repulsive smirk.

But while this statement explains somewhat our friend's theory of treatment, it must be observed that all this care could easily be fatal to success, unless he secured the presence of a still higher element more intangible than these. His analysis could endanger the life of the subject, making the real man seem only a corpse under the knife of the dissecting surgeon. His studied completion of parts could break up the life into disjointed fragments, and his adjustment of the elements of character might prove nothing but a timid and tedious balancing of thesis and antithesis. It was necessary that throughout his work the shadow of the man himself should somehow rest upon it. He had to work minutely to preserve exact proportions, and all the while to convey that general idea of life-likeness which cannot be superimposed, nor interposed, but must in fact be *supposed*. It was manifest that this was the most elusive element to be reached after; the rest could in some sort be attained by study, and carefully won, but this lay outside of any special effort, and was rather the reward of patient labor in other directions.

• "O that those lips had language!"

was surely spoken beneath a portrait which by its faithfulness seemed almost the reality, and just so far as a memoir makes us forget the printed page and its author, and feel the

"Touch of a vanished hand,
The sound of a voice that is still,"

so far it is a successful *memoir* or memory-life. In catching and conveying this air of likeness, however he succeeded, he felt himself aided very much by his personal and familiar acquaintance with the one whom he was characterizing.

"I do not see," he said to us, "how I could possibly write with any sort of satisfaction in its truthfulness the life of a person whom I did not know intimately, much less one whom I never saw at all, who lived perhaps in another age and in foreign society. Now I have been able at each stage of my work to call up — vividly before me, to see him just as he then looked, and though I cannot produce the peculiar expression of his face at particular occasions, for words are not lines, yet I am greatly helped by it in imparting a confident air of truthfulness to the scene. Indeed, I felt the aid very strongly when I had occasion to write of him in situations where I had no personal acquaintance."

It may be added to this, or rather it may be said instead of it, for we do not attach the same importance to personal acquaintance which our friend maintained, that he possessed the more valuable aid of an affectionate enthusiasm for his subject. This it was which was likely to make his representation life-like, for it supplied the warm blood that should flow through the veins of the character recorded, and if it failed to manifest itself, it was because of a too sober cast of mind in the biographer, and not because of any apprehension which he felt lest his enthusiasm and affection should render him partial in judgment. It is often urged that a near relation is disqualified from writing the life of a person, but surely not unless the relation be *non compos mentis*; for what intellectual skill can construct the friendship and sympathy essential for correct comprehension of a man's character, comparable with that born in one of the same blood and kinship? The world does not want exact lines in the portraits of its hero's face, nearly so

much as it wants the warm life which can make it believe in the existence there of a common nature.

To the biographer himself engaged earnestly in his work there fell rewards which he had not anticipated, but which came to be in his mind the most satisfying of any which could be granted. As he got more deeply into his work he found it more absorbing in interest, and the daily allotment of time which he began with gradually extended its limits. Nor did his subject leave him at the end of his working hours, but intruded itself into his thoughts at all times. At first he tried to escape from it, oppressed by this constant visitor; he fled for relief to other pursuits and distracting entertainments. But since he daily returned to his subject at the appointed hour he strengthened its hold upon his interest, until he became reconciled to the constant presence and found in it a quiet joy. It is much to live with a good man day after day, to think of his character, even though, indeed because, it often utters its silent reproof; to enquire into his source of power, and to be so at one with him, that for a time you also seem to have something of the same earnestness of purpose, are thrilled with the enthusiasm which he possessed, and go with him through the scenes which tried his soul, as if you were undergoing the same experience.

The oblique light too, which our friend's study cast upon other matters which interested him, was often more valuable than the direct rays which he tried to throw upon them. Indeed, there seemed to him no other study, except the study of the life of Christ, which was so productive as the study of the life of one man. You live, he would say, for months in the company of a single person; you are let into secrets of his life which only he and you may know; you analyze his life and reconstruct it in your memorial, and by all this study you get a deeper insight into the human heart than would be possible by any general study of classes of men, or movements in history, far deeper certainly than is possible to get through mere familiarity with many living faces. But when all is done, when you have tried to fathom this one man's heart, you know that you have only troubled the face of the waters with your lead, that deeper, than any plummet of the human intellect can sound, lie depths of the soul, and you arise from your task

with new conceptions of the worth of humanity and profounder views of that redemption which was so costly because the ruin was so great.

When his work was completed, and he had read over for the last of a long series of times the paragraphs which he had constructed, he pushed it all away with a sigh and turning to us said, half in jest: "There it is all done, and I wish never to look at it again. I feel about it as I do about a picture of my best friend. That I refuse to ask for, because I would rather work the absent face thoroughly into my soul by repeated willed recollections, than turn indolently to a picture to refresh my memory; to do this would in time cause all my recollection to be bounded by the single meagre expression. In the same way I would rather have the glory of one of Turner's pictures growing dim in my memory, if it must, than pack it all within a steel engraving. ——— is now mine more thoroughly than he ever was in life, but if I read this book over whenever I want to think of him, he will gradually dwindle down into the limits constructed by my memoir."

Such were some of the points in our friend's experience as he assayed to be a biographer. He often told us of the reflections which he made from time to time, but he left no memoranda of them and we cannot recall them. Our own task has been that of the historian, not of the critic, and therefore we have properly abstained from any estimate of his work. He himself had criticised it so much that he said he had lost, he thought, any anxiety as to what others might say of it; his chief apprehension was lest the friends of the person whose life he had written might be disappointed in the failure of the sketch to answer their own recollection. Beyond that he could not bring himself to borrow trouble. We venture to express the hope that our own biographer, who is now to consider himself duly appointed our successor in the biographic line, will perform his task in the same temper, regardless of ordinary criticism and only anxious to be truthful in recording the experience which we have passed through in preparing this biographical sketch.

ARTICLE IV.—REVIEW OF DR. BUSHNELL ON “THE VICARIOUS SACRIFICE.”

The Vicarious Sacrifice, grounded in Principles of Universal Obligation. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner & Co., 124 Grand street. 1866. 8vo. pp. 552.

WE may safely assume that this volume will be very generally read. Many will peruse it from curiosity to learn what is the last word from Dr. Bushnell in respect to one of the most important doctrines of the Christian system—remembering that his former utterances upon this subject have been seriously called in question. Many others who have been interested in his sermons, and in his “Nature and the Supernatural,” will expect to find genius, eloquence, and Christian feeling largely present in a treatise upon so inspiring a theme as Christ’s redeeming work.

Very many more will be attracted to it, because they are dissatisfied with the theories of the atonement which are currently received, and are earnestly looking for some explanation which shall be more satisfactory to their reason, their Christian feelings, and the teachings of the Scriptures. Not a few of the younger theologians, preachers, and laymen may accept the volume as expressing in many of its positions the conclusions which they have already received, and therefore welcome the authority of Dr. Bushnell’s name and the force of his reasonings, as most important auxiliaries in the service of what they conceive to be a better theology. We say this most distinctly at the outset of our discussion, because it ought neither to be disguised nor concealed, that the chief opinions expressed in this volume are neither original with nor peculiar to Dr. Bushnell. His modes of presenting and defending them are sufficiently his own; but in the doctrines which he teaches, he is a representative and follower of a very extensive school of thinkers, whose influence is great and steadily increasing in every part of

Protestant Christendom. Schleiermacher urged these views in Germany with his remarkable gifts of subtle analysis and eloquent exposition. Many theologians of the school of Schleiermacher, even of that branch of it which adheres most closely to the symbols and the spirit of the Reformation, adopt very nearly the same expositions of the import of the life and death of Christ which Dr. Bushnell has propounded. In England, Coleridge, in his doctrine of the Redemptive work, did, as is well known, attack all the previously received theories of the atonement with arguments like those which Dr. Bushnell employs, while Maurice and the divines of his school not only follow Coleridge in their negative positions, but follow Schleiermacher, and agree with Dr. Bushnell in their positive expositions of the import of "the vicarious sacrifice." Not only have these views been largely received by the Church of England, but they have been accepted with favor among the Congregationalists of that country. If we are not incorrectly informed, even the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland, in all of which it would be a capital offense to confess in form the doctrine of unlimited or universal atonement, are by no means unaffected by the theories of the school of Maurice. The oaken framework of the Scottish theology to the eye stands entire and unchanged as of old. It would seem that every timber and brace is as stiff and unyielding as ever, but the dry rot of this new theory of the work of Christ has insinuated itself into many of the timbers, and loosened not a few of the joints.

Dr. Bushnell, perhaps, stands in this country foremost as the representative of this theory of Christ's redemptive work, which has become somewhat formidable in its claims and influence. Though he is not prone to confess himself to be the representative of any opinions but those which he deems peculiarly his own, he does, in his preface, recognize a tendency in the church toward a "final doctrine of the subject," of which "the grand ruling conception finally established will be that Christ, by his suffering, life, and ministry, becomes a reconciling power in character, the power of God unto salvation."

We do not inquire at present into the causes of this tendency of opinion. We shall not affirm whether it is to be ascribed to

a lower religious tone, and a less reverent fear of God, leading to habits of reasoning and interpretations less rigorous and less exact than once prevailed ; or on the other hand, whether it is a sign of a deeper insight into the true import of the Scriptures, which is the result of better methods of interpretation. We shall not inquire how far these views result from yielding unwarrantably to the suggestions of the imagination, or how far they are to be explained by a violent reaction against the extravagant and untenable theories of the older orthodoxy. We notice this tendency as a fact, which fact is a reason for attaching greater importance to the views of Dr. Bushnell, than they would demand if they were regarded as the idiosyncrasies of a single individual, however ably and eloquently they might be asserted.

In examining the volume, we do not propose to give an analysis of its contents, or to follow out its course of argument and assertions by a critical commentary for approval or refutation. To do the first is needless, for we may assume that those of our readers who will read our criticism will have previously read the volume. To do the second is impossible, for it would require a volume as large or larger than Dr. Bushnell's to do justice to all the themes which would demand our attention.

We propose to consider in order a few of the strong and a few of the weak points in this volume. Under the strong points, we include those features in which it has any advantage over other treatises upon its theme, whether this advantage comes from a better method of treatment or from sounder views of the truth. Under the weak points, we shall consider its positive oversights and errors.

We hope to write in no spirit of captious criticism, or of special devotion to the interests of any of the received theological systems. It is almost needless to say that we shall not be tempted to avail ourselves of the cheap expedients of religious partisanship, to denounce and decry the friend whom we admire and esteem, and the writer who has done good service for Christ and the church by his eloquent expositions and defenses of Christian truth.

The strong points, to some extent the real excellencies of this volume, are the following :

1. The book is remarkably free from the technicalities of theology. The arguments and illustrations are brought within the reach of men untrained in the dialect and unused to the distinctions of theological schools. It is an element of power with Dr. Bushnell that he uses the language, arguments, and illustrations, which are addressed to thinking and cultivated men of all conditions in life, and which suppose no special initiation into scholastic terminology. His discussions are not the less subtle or profound for this reason. But they are incomparably more fresh and forcible, and are more easily followed by all classes of readers. They are much broader also, bringing into view the relations of the principles and truths involved, to the principles that are recognized in the actual world of living and breathing men, and which are responded to by the convictions, and the conscience of every human soul. Hence, his theological discussions when subtle and over-refined are always interesting—when they are incoherent and fanciful, they are still so illustrated and enforced that the mind is stimulated to new trains of thought, and some valuable truth is suggested if none is directly taught. The boldness of his thinking imparts an energy and directness to his style. The independence, and even the audacity of his positions, require a corresponding daring in his arguments and illustrations. Views so fresh and original as his, can only be fitly expressed in a fresh and glowing style.

It is not merely that Dr. Bushnell is a writer of genius and power, and must therefore write with interest even when he treats of theological themes, but it is true that he has a genius for writing on such subjects, in such a way as to bring them within the range of the common thinking of cultivated men, and to awaken a profound moral and religious interest in the truths which he discusses. He never separates these principles from their direct and practical application to the feelings and the life. In his hands they are never dead dogmas or lifeless abstractions, with only a speculative interest for logical refiners, but they are always living truths, which require and evoke a warm response from every soul.

These peculiarities certainly give to the volume a great advantage over theological treatises as they are commonly written.

They are fitted to secure for his doctrine a favorable hearing. They must be regarded also as real excellencies. In times like these, and in a country like ours, where the readers of theological treatises read so much besides, upon common and even profound themes, which is written in a familiar and untechnical style, when even the students of theology read so much of history, philosophy, and literature, it seems to be a necessity that even theological discussions should, as far as possible, be free from everything like a stereotyped or traditional diction, and should be enlivened by manly thinking and the diction which is common to all literature.

It would react advantageously upon theologians themselves, if they were compelled to couch old arguments in new forms of speech, and to defend and illustrate the unchanging truths of the word by arguments and illustrations adapted to modern thinking. Perhaps the charm of some old dogmas would vanish with the slight changes that would be thus effected in the phraseology in which they are expressed. Perhaps old errors would more naturally and easily be sloughed off from the eternal truths, by the very process of translating them into a new dialect, and the minds of those who are set for the defense of the truth would be enlarged to a wider toleration and softened to a diviner charity.

Certainly the hearers of so-called "doctrinal" sermons would be surprised to find that the preaching of Christian doctrine had become the most interesting of all kinds of preaching, and the readers of theological treatises would learn that theology itself is the divinest and the most inspiring of all the sciences. We do not by any means commend all the peculiarities of Dr. Bushnell's thinking or writing. He is least of all to be set up as a model to be blindly copied. But his freshness and freedom of thinking and writing, and the warm and practical interest with which he invests his themes and his arguments, are to be counted to his praise, even when they serve to give currency to serious defects or errors of opinion.

2. Dr. Bushnell has gained another advantage for the impression of his book, in the circumstance that he aims to treat of the whole of Christ's redemptive work, and actually gives prominence to many aspects of it which are often overlooked.

As sin involves many evils, the work of Redemption involves as many forms of deliverance, and Christ, by his life and death, accomplishes and completes them all. "Thou shalt call his name Jesus, for He shall save His people from their sins." Whatever is the form of evil which sin has induced, Christ has for it a remedy, or rather He is Himself the remedy. Sin involves subjection to the human body, with its disabilities of obstruction, of animal preponderances, of disease, weakness, and painful death. Sin involves in the toils, the strifes, the disappointments, the vanity of an earthly life. It subjects to the fearful inheritance of a disturbed and corrupted moral constitution; too often developed by voluntary indulgence into habits of moral life, which eat like a cancer into the very substance of our being, and grow with frightful rapidity and disproportion till they become the veriest tyrants of the inner man. It takes possession of the intellect, perverts its action, turns the light within us into darkness, and makes reason itself an advocate, philosopher, and orator—a poet, preacher, and law-giver—in the service of evil, putting light for darkness and darkness for light. Sin entangles us in all the fearful liabilities of our social existence, and manages to bring fashion, opinion, and legislation upon the side of our corrupt wishes, and to make them weave for us a net-work of chains—"light as silk, but strong as the toughest iron." It uses the venerable and awful authority of religion in its service. It even creates new gods for itself, or exalts itself into the very place of the living Jehovah, "so that Sin, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." The terrific power for the service of sin which has come from false religion, whether in the forms of the idolatries and priesthoods of Paganism, of the church power, the one-sided and corrupted theologies of Christianity, and of the Atheisms and Pantheisms of the so-called Religion of nature, it would not be easy to overestimate. Last of all, sin has exposed man to the deserved displeasure of the living God—under the consciousness of which as a present fact his soul is forever cowed and depressed, and in the apprehension of what may come of it, he is, "through fear of death," all his "life time subject to bondage."

From all these evils Christ redeems man, and he does it by the life which he lived, and the death which he suffered as the Incarnate One. It is as a Redeemer from all these forms of evil that he is set forth in the Scriptures—now in one aspect, now in another—at one time in many, at another in few, with a noble carelessness of precise definition or of careful proportion, as to which aspect of his work were the more important, such as was to be expected of writers who saw in Christ all they wanted, and could not imagine it possible that he should not relieve them from every real evil.

Theology has by no means followed this method in its conceptions of the work of Christ. Through its anxiety to give due prominence to those aspects of it which it has thought most important, it has persistently left out of view all the rest, and sometimes it has seemed almost to deny their reality. Especially has it been tempted to do this, when the more important element in it has been denied or practically set aside. Romish Theology, by means of penances and indulgences, and the service of the Virgin and the confessional and priestly absolution, greatly diminished the significance of the atoning work. Protestant Theology, ever since the Reformation, has almost forgotten that Christ has done anything else than by his death to provide the ground for man's free pardon. Because the Socinians denied the reality of his Incarnation, and any special significance in his death, their opponents have been ready to deny any moral power in his human life, in its relations to the generation and epoch in which he lived, and have practically sunk out of sight many winning and consoling influences which flow from that life for all time. It has happened in consequence that the stress of orthodox Protestant preaching concerning Christ has been laid upon his atoning work. Though the Protestant confessions and catechisms have recognized the other aspects of his life and death, yet these have scarcely entered into the practical faith of the Church. They have but feebly affected the feelings and inspired the life of either preachers or disciples. Argument and controversy, exhortation and consolation, have been concerned almost exclusively with his death. The result has been not only that much of the power and interest which lie within the person of Christ has been lost to

the Church, but the most efficient means of interpreting and defending the atoning import of his death, has been thereby abandoned, and the effect of that death has been the more feebly apprehended and believed.

By a natural reaction, those who have been impressed with the importance and interest of those aspects of Christ's work which had been neglected or overlooked, have found in them the entire explanation of this work. They have seemed to themselves to have discovered such new revelations of truth, such meanings unheard of before in his personal influence, that they have imagined that in this was to be found the sole interpretation of his mission and his power. Schleiermacher finds in the person of Christ a new life-giving power for the race, because in him was first exemplified a spirit of self-sacrifice even unto death, in order that He might redeem and save. From his name and person, thus consecrated by his death, there streams forth into the life of the race influences that have forever hallowed self-sacrifice, self-denial, and forbearance on the part of God, and repentance and faith in that name on the part of sinning man. Maurice writes in a similar strain, emphasizing and expanding all these aspects and influences of the vicarious sacrifice that was perpetually offered in the life and death of the Redeemer. Dr. Bushnell, with his vivid power to conceive, his rare eloquence to set forth, and above all his rarer sensibility to appreciate the moral beauty and the redeeming power that there is in Christ as a person, through his life and death of sacrificing love, so preoccupies and interests his readers with these less familiar conceptions of Christ's work, that many are ready to go with him to the conclusion that they completely exhaust and explain its import.

3. Dr. Bushnell has secured to his volume and his doctrine another advantage, in the circumstance that in exhibiting the work of Christ, he has followed the order of its actual history and development. As he very properly essays to exhibit the whole work of Christ, so he wisely begins his exposition of this work at the beginning, and traces its unfolding to the end. He makes Christ to live before us in the progress and development of his life, not so much in the chronological and external facts which make up its history, as in the progress of the moral

impressions which it works out in a natural and necessary order. He makes his readers conceive the world of thought and feeling concerning God and duty, concerning goodness and sin, concerning holiness and salvation, into which Christ enters. He helps them to trace the changes which his presence is silently and surely effecting till He leaves the world. He shows how these impressions are all gathered into one, and reproduced by the event of his significant death, and how both life and death are transfigured into a diviner meaning and irresistible energy by the power of his resurrection. In all this, he does well, and for the success with which he has done this work he deserves all honor. The service is not only important in itself, but it is essential that we may fully understand Christ. That the Church should require, and that theology should follow this method of studying the work of Christ, is not so much *a merit* as it is *a necessity*. In order to understand its meaning, we must not only view all its relations in their symmetry and mutual helpfulness, but we must see them drawn out in the order of their development, one impression preparing the way for another, till the manifestation of God through Christ is felt to be complete, and the student of it is prepared to see what it was and how "it is finished."

We regret that Dr. Bushnell has not carried the history of this manifestation through Christ to its end, but has abruptly cut it short, and thus failed to do justice to the import of its concluding and sublimest passages. He skillfully unfolds the gradually increasing hold which Christ is gaining during his lifetime, the intenseness of interest which is gathered about his impending death—the majesty with which the self-sacrificing love which was illustrated in his humble life is exalted to its throne of power over the soul, when he ascends to the right hand of the Majesty on High; but here he rests. He forgets that the history of the Incarnation does not terminate here!—that the same being who was present so long in the body promised to return, and did return in a more effective way to the same circle who in his lifetime received direct impressions from his bodily presence; that the *Parakletos* who was to come in his name was to revive all these impressions, and give them new energy, because he would interpret and enlarge their

meaning. He was to guide them into all truth. He would not speak from himself, but from Christ, and would impart and interpret some of the many things which Christ could not say in his lifetime, because they could not bear [intelligence and lovingly receive] them. But as soon as the Son of Man should be glorified by the attesting resurrection, then He could communicate and they could receive. What he did impart the succeeding history informs us. We say the succeeding history, for the expositions which the Apostles gave of the work of Christ in the fragments of speeches which the Acts of the Apostles record, and in the few brief epistles, are as properly parts of that history as are the impressions which came directly from his lips and his life, as recorded by the Evangelists. These new impressions were sanctioned by Christ, who instructed and enlarged their minds in a supernatural way as really and more effectually than when He spake and lived before them.

This work was gradual and orderly as was the work of his life, but it was the work of Christ none the less. At first, the comprehensive burden of the discourses of the Apostles, as it was the fact of their faith, was the Messiahship of Jesus, as attested by his works and resurrection. But at this point we find, even in the first exposition of Christ's work made by Peter, that the direction is to baptism—i. e., to open confession of faith in the name of Jesus Christ, *for the remission of sins*. In the next recorded speech it is said, "Unto you first God having raised up his Son Jesus sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." In the next, "Neither is their salvation in any other, for there is none other name under Heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." In the following, "Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins." Soon after, "Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Then follow the fuller and more elaborate expositions of the import and relations of Christ's work that are given in the Epistles of Paul, and that

are attested in the epistles of Peter and John, all of which are parts of one continued history, 'with the difference that in the earlier part of it we have Christ living and speaking on earth; and in the latter part of it, the same Christ speaking from Heaven, explaining as it were his life and death—now that they are finished, and the glory of the person who gave them power and meaning is fully displayed.

We are well aware that Dr. Bushnell will not agree with us in the interpretation of the passages to which we have referred. Which is the right interpretation, we will discuss in its proper place. The point with which we are at present concerned, is simply that Dr. Bushnell has not followed the history of Christ to its proper termination. He makes the history of the direct impressions from Christ to end with his resurrection. Henceforward, all the operative force of his life and death lay in the *natural* interpretation which his followers placed upon his glorification as the Son of God. He leaves out of sight the fact of another teacher, who spake in his name, and widened and deepened his influence. Without giving large importance to the functions and the power of that agent, the growth and spread of Christianity as an historical fact is inexplicable and incredible. Assuming these functions, they make it easy to understand and natural to believe, with the evidence for the fact before us, that Christ taught and explained a larger import concerning his work, than that which Dr. Bushnell finds recorded and implied in the history, as recorded in the Gospels alone. While we concede to Dr. Bushnell all the advantages of both impression and argument which come from following the historical method, we note his defect in not tracing this history to its proper termination.

4. Dr. Bushnell has another advantage, in this, that his proper argument concerning the atoning work is not purely nor drily metaphysical. We mean by this much more than we have before expressed, respecting his freedom from a technical handling of his theme. The atoning work of Christ, or the doctrine of the atonement, as it is usually called, is ordinarily discussed and defended in the forms and language of pure science. It also suffers more than any other doctrine, in respect to the very material of the argument, from being so defended.

The fact is unquestioned, and the reason is obvious. From the *Cur Deus Homo* of Anselm down to the last treatise of a modern divine, these discussions and defenses are uniformly made to turn upon the ground of the necessity that an atonement should be made. This ground is as uniformly found in some reason of justice, more or less generally conceived. This at once leads to the discussion of what justice is, what are its demands, on what condition it can waive its claims, how does Christ and his death satisfy or meet these demands. Questions of this sort, though moral and religious in their occasion and their application, are yet as technically scientific and metaphysical in their character, as are discussions of pure geometry and philosophy. So far as they are discussed in their logical relations they only task the intellect to unusual refinements and unwelcome efforts. The mind instead of being confronted with warming and comforting truths, encounters the thinnest and the most ghost-like abstractions, which flit before the vision and undergo the most embarrassing metamorphoses. It is no wonder that those who are unaccustomed to such impalpable entities, and who are undisciplined to the efforts required to grasp them, are wearied and disgusted with the discussions, and perhaps with the truths to which they relate. The result has been that the defense of the most interesting and important of all the themes of Christian theology, has become associated with the driest and most repulsive of abstractions.

The argument for the necessity and fact of an atonement has suffered in its material also from this cause. The best defense of both is to be found in the adequate conception and the vivid presentation of the real import of what Christ has actually done and suffered, drawn directly from the descriptions of the Gospel when interpreted by the repenting and believing soul. The power of this work to atone lies in the direct impression which is made upon the heart by what the incarnate Son of God is known actually to do and suffer. As we shall endeavor to show in its place, when this is understood with all its accessories it explains and vindicates the atoning work. It shows that it was needed by showing what was done. When this is appreciated in its import, then the abstract definitions take a concrete meaning and application, the distinctions between gen-

eral and distributive justice, between *solutio* and *acceptilatio* become intelligible because they respect a concrete fact. These distinctions cannot be dispensed with. These theological formulæ are necessary if theology is to be a science. But formulæ without something furnished to formulate are empty of meaning and interest. It is only when that something is set forth that the symbols of definition and reasoning have either import or interest. Dr. Bushnell sees this distinction dimly and states it badly when he says: "The view of Christ's mission I have been trying to establish excludes the possibility, it will be seen, of any dogmatic formula in which it may be adequately stated." And again, "The Scriptures themselves do not know how to make up any formula of three or four lines, that will express, in the manner of our theologians, the import of Christ's reconciling work." "Christ is no form of thought. He is no proposition. He is given neither by nor to, logical definition. He is no quantitative matter, like a credit set in a book, or a punishment graduated by satisfaction. His reality is what he expresses, under laws of expression, &c., &c." "Hence the necessary poverty and almost mockery of all attempts to put the work of Christ in formula or to dogmatize it in a proposition or church article," pp. 213, 14. After this and much more of the sort, he proceeds to try to formulate his power under four specifications! But though Dr. Bushnell is not very consistent with himself, and, while he denounces theology and metaphysics to his heart's content, proceeds to furnish some questionable specimens of both, he yet seeks to furnish something besides, viz. a definite and living portraiture of the work which he thinks Christ performed. In this lies much of the power of his book, for in this particular of method it compares advantageously with most treatises upon the atonement.

5. Dr. Bushnell has an advantage in that he represents and appeals to a very prevailing disposition to distrust and decry all positive and objective Theological science and Theological truth. The advantage is not legitimate, but it is none the less real. It is founded as we believe in intellectual and moral causes which are very largely significant of weakness and evil. But the tendency exists, and its causes are powerful in their working. We name in passing some of them. The wrangling

of partisan theologians and of partisan preachers has disgusted not a few thinking people and weakened their estimate of Theology itself. The higher value which is placed upon the essential truths of Christianity has tended to depress the interest in those which are conceived to be subordinate, and in any further inquiries or discussions in respect to their true interpretation. The larger charity between the diverse sects and families of the household of Christ, has led to a diminished interest in the peculiarities of either, especially in mere verbal differences in stating and defending the same essential truths and in the plainly human philosophies by which they are conceived and explained. Prejudices against theology like these are all of a good complexion, and however much they might work to the disesteem of theological inquiry and discussion as superfluous, they could be easily guided to a better and more enlightened judgment. There are others which are more obstinate and insidious. For they tend not only to weaken the confidence of the church in the creeds and systems of theologians, but in the positive and definite import of the teachings of the Scriptures. They even go further. They tend to destroy confidence in the capacity of the human mind to conceive of God and the relations of his government with any positive results of thought or language. The general scepticism of Kant in respect to the competence of the human intellect to attain to solid knowledge, involved of necessity the impossibility of any theology, whether Natural or Revealed. His principles were sanctioned in part by Hamilton. They were distinctly taught by Mansel with the ostensible design of humbling rationalism and limiting human reason, but with the real effect of exalting church and priestly authority over rational interpretation and independent investigation. The more flattering substitute of blind and groping feeling for an intellectually conceiving and intelligently loving faith which Jacobi, Schleiermacher, Maurice, Robertson, and others have introduced to eke out the incompetence of the intellect, has only deepened and broadened the distrust of creeds and theology. It has led on the one side to a contemptuous depreciation of any and all creeds as feeble attempts to express the many sided and exhaustless infinite, and on the other to a demoralizing and latitudinarian readiness to assent to any

and every creed, which has debauched the conscience to a disingenuous use of the doctrine of reserve and of the liberty of private interpretation, because of the confessed inadequacy of all creeds and all theologies to set forth the Divine.

This distrust of scientific theology Dr. Bushnell largely represents, and to its special prejudices and its capricious moods, he addresses his arguments, or rather this distrust or denial of the possibility of any scientific statements of Christian truth, furnishes him with many of his arguments. We cannot here discuss the soundness of his position any further than to suggest that a position of this kind, if it is good for any, should suffice for every service. What is good for attack is equally good to repel an attack, and it is no better for one side than another, whether it is used in assault or defense. When it is convenient for Dr. B. to assail a theology on the ground of inexactness of statement, inconsistency of thought, or insufficiency of proof, he does it without a scruple. When his own theology is assailed on similar grounds, he quietly says he does not believe in theology at all. As if scientific theology were anything but a more exact and consistent and thoroughly grounded thinking than that which is common and necessary to all men. As if its terms, definitions, reconciliations, and proofs, were not all represented in common language and reasoning. As if Dr. Bushnell could state and define his own opinions about "the vicarious sacrifice" without theologizing. As if he does not constantly furnish specimens in this very discussion of *formulated* thought, as gratuitous and as scholastic as any which the older schools have incorporated into creeds and systems.

While we insist that Dr. Bushnell cannot legitimately take advantage of the prevailing sceptical distrust of scientific theology, we cannot deny that he gains thereby an advantage which is real for the more favorable judgment of his own views.

6. Dr. Bushnell has an advantage in the successful onsets which he makes upon false and defective theories of the necessity and nature of the atoning work. Though Dr. Bushnell abjures theological reasoning, yet he exhibits no mean power in criticising the unsound theologies of others. In Part III.,

Chap. vi., he reviews the three theories which would naturally require his notice. He considers first, the theory that the penalty of sin is inflicted upon the Son to satisfy and vindicate the justice of God, which is commonly called the Old School view. He then discusses the singular modification of this theory which is urged by Prof. Shedd, according to which the atonement satisfies the ethical sentiment of justice in God himself, by the infliction and the suffering of punishment upon and by God himself, the punisher being also the sufferer. The third theory is that which is known as the New England or the Edwardean theory, according to which, if we may trust the statement of Dr. Bushnell, there is in the death of Christ an expression of God's abhorrence of sin equivalent to that which would have been expressed by the infliction of punishment upon the sinner. The first and second of these theories he notices briefly. They require and are capable of a brief answer—because that answer is simple; if justice can be satisfied only by the infliction of punishment, then an atonement or expiation is impossible. Punishment to be punishment must be endured by the guilty. Evil inflicted upon any other than the guilty cannot be penal. Whether it be voluntarily accepted or not makes not the least difference in this regard. Nor is it material whether the sufferer be the second person of the Godhead on whose human nature the "*punishment*" is said to be inflicted, or whether it be the same as God self-inflicting and self-assuming the so-called eternal behest of justice. There is not, and cannot be, under either of these theories, either justice, or punishment, or expiation.

The third of these theories detains him longer, as it reasonably should. He first states the theory inadequately and then by "a fetch of words" he manages apparently to dispose of it, and to seem to set it aside. His argument against this theory is built solely upon the single phrase which he employs to characterize it. He argues that to express "abhorrence of sin" is not the end of punishment, and if it were, how, he asks, can God's abhorrence of sin be shown in the suffering death of Christ? We do not admit his argument as decisive, but he starts the one question and urges the one objection which press upon that theory. How it is to be relieved from the pressure un-

der which it seems to labor, we will not now discuss. We concede that the author seems to gain over this theory, *as he conceives and describes it*, a real advantage in the argument.

The apparently easy and satisfactory demolition of opposing theories always gives an advantage to any argument, and Dr. Bushnell has managed to secure to himself the impression that he has gained such an advantage.

Thus far have we considered the strong points of the volume. We have discussed these at some length because we wish our readers to understand wherein lies the real merit and truth of the book, and also wherein they may find the plausible grounds for even its oversights and errors.

We turn now to the consideration of some of these oversights and errors.

1. Dr. Bushnell is, as we think, unsuccessful in the distinction which he makes between "necessary law" and "instituted government," and the distinction correspondent to it between "righteousness" and "justice." This distinction is essential to his entire theory of the relations of the work of Christ to the holiness and law of God. He relies upon this and the inferences and applications which he derives from it, to satisfy all the aims proposed by the theories usually received, and to give relief from all their difficulties. He draws it out at great length. The defense and application of it cover a quarter of his volume. It comprehends the philosophy which underlies his entire superstructure of doctrine. It is continually shooting up into every part of this structure; reappearing perpetually in some new form of justification or defense.

The occasion of it is no novelty in the history of theories of atonement. The distinction was suggested by the same difficulties of theory which have compelled other theologians to resort to such distinctions as those between general and distributive justice, and between the authority of God and the sanctions of His law. It is none the less metaphysical than any of these. The adoption and defense of it show abundantly that the author is a "man of like passions" and infirmities with other men in respect to metaphysics and formulæ and systems, and that metaphysical reasoning comes to him as to other men, "by nature." It is even a more ambitious scheme

of metaphysical daring than those which we commonly meet with, for it aspires to take the subject out of the "analogies of law and justice, and penalty and pardon, prepared in the civil state," and to get "a partially distinct footing for the subject which is not under such analogies."

The ingenuity of this metaphysical scheme is admirable. It proves not only that the author will occasionally indulge in the metaphysical vein, but that he is a dialectician of no mean art and skill, in that he lays his foundations deep down and far away from their immediate application, and forecasts the use which he will make of them with subtle sagacity. Or at least it shows how he was pressed by the desire to sustain his concrete theory, to find for it a consistent and coherent scheme of philosophy.

The theory briefly stated is as follows. A distinction should be made "between law before government, and law by government; uninstituted, necessary law, and law enacted and supported by instituted government." The law before government is "that necessary, everlasting, ideal law of Right, which simply to think is to be forever obliged by it." The conformity of God's purposes and actions to this law constitutes his *righteousness*. As soon as this "impersonal law" is insufficient for any reason, and God steps forth from this plane of action to enforce it by "personal authority or will-force embarked," then commences "instituted government" upon the plane or in the sphere of which the relations of *justice*, as distinguished from righteousness, become possible. Under the first the consequence of sin is only subjective "moral disorder." Under the second only can come retribution and penalty. Instituted government with its liabilities to penalty only begins when sin against righteousness has actually commenced; instituted government is therefore only a means to and a part of redemption. Before redemption is begun the obligations are to righteousness only, and the results of sin involve moral disorder, but no penalty. There is no need of atonement to lay the ground for forgiveness in order to redemption, for before redemption there is no instituted law, and where there is no law there is no transgression and no penalty. The question of the need of atonement as a ground for justification cannot possibly

come up, for such questions can only present themselves within the sphere of "instituted government," which exists only in the service and for the use of redemption, under which penalty is only "a milling and grinding" process for simple recovery. It cannot be raised within the sphere of "law before government," for in that sphere there is no penalty conceivable from which we are to be delivered, but only moral disorder from which we are to be recovered. Neither expiation nor satisfaction are conceivable, because there is no occasion for either. The righteousness of God as distinguished from his justice does not require either. The justice of God cannot demand either of his righteousness, for his righteousness has ordained justice and made penalty possible by introducing law in order to redemption. From this theory, conceived as possibly true, the author "legitimizes" the following conceptions:

1. That there might be a scheme of cross, and sacrifice, and restoring power, every way like that which is executed in Christ, which has nothing to do with justice proper: being related only to that *quasi* justice which is the blind effect, in moral natures, of a violation of their necessary law.
2. That instituted law is no necessary precondition of redemption.
3. That the righteousness of God is not by any means identical with his justice, but includes all the perfections of God in his relation to the law before government, and never requires him to execute justice under political analogies, save as it first requires him to institute an administrative government in the same.
4. That law and justice might be instituted as co-factors of redemption, having it for their object to simply work with redemption, and serve the same ends of spiritual renovation—if there was a prior fall, under the law before government they naturally would be.
5. That justification need not have any reference to God's justice, and probably has not, but only to a reconnection, by faith, with the righteousness of God, and a consciously new confidence, in the sense of that connection. pp. 247-8.

We have given this theory at greater length than we intended, that we might be entirely just to the author, and because it is fundamental to the construction and defense of every argument and interpretation which he urges.

That which gives plausibility to it in the general is the impression which rests upon almost every mind, that analogies from political governments are inadequate to express and illustrate the whole truth in respect to the necessity of an atoning efficacy in the work of Christ. All men readily feel with Cole-

ridge that no analogies from the coarse and imperfect workings of human law-courts can adequately explain the whole of Christ's redemptive work. They earnestly search after some deeper and more purely ethical truth beneath this artificial structure of which human government is but an inadequate analogon. This feeling has been intensified by the infelicitous and distasteful habit of carrying these analogies to extremes, of drawing out and illustrating from the relations of human rule and authority in minute detail, thus belittling the whole subject by bringing in many particulars which it is felt have no possible relation to the truth to be illustrated. While the theory that Christ literally suffered a penalty or literally payed a debt simply offends the conscience, the "governmental theory," as it is barbarously termed, fails to meet the taste and sense of fitness by the inadequacy of its analogies. Hence it is in many minds regarded with the prejudices of mere association contracted from the unhappy manner in which it has been illustrated. The attempt of Dr. Bushnell to rise above or see through these analogies and reach the principle on which they rest, would naturally be greeted with favor by many and would prepossess them kindly toward the principle for which he contends.

Another circumstance works strongly in Dr. Bushnell's favor. The New Testament, when it treats of the law of Moses as an "instituted government," expressly asserts that it was founded in the interest of the scheme of redemption. It was the "schoolmaster to bring us to Christ." It says of it also that it was "added because of transgression." It also asserts that simple command, i. e., what the author calls "will force embarked" excites hostility in the heart determined to disobey, and is fitted to provoke both resistance and despair. With the law as operating to such effects, the grace of the Gospel and its recovering and forbearing love are contrasted as introducing motives nobler in their character and more genial in their operation. It has become the fashion of late for evangelical interpreters of the modern school to find in the New Testament no higher conception of law than that of a positive and "instituted government" like the Mosaic system. They have also fallen into the habit of speaking of the motives and influences which come from law of every kind as essentially inferior to

those from love, and as made necessary by the circumstance that man by the apostasy had fallen below the plane in which holiness could assert upon him its direct and higher attractions.

We think these interpretations of the apostolic reasonings concerning the law of Moses, and this depreciation of the moral law as less amiable in its aspect than love, are superficial and erroneous. We believe that what Dr. Bushnell calls law eternal and necessary, as illustrated through the Mosaic law, is often the real theme of the apostolic reasoning, when the two are not formally distinguished. Moreover, we believe that when Paul speaks of law in the higher sense he never concedes that its authority is less reasonable and its motives less ethical, than are the influence and attractions of the Gospel. If Dr. Bushnell has turned the interpretations, which are sanctioned by so high authority, to the service of his own metaphysical theory, we cannot be surprised. Perhaps the use to which he has applied them will induce a revision of these interpretations and conceptions.

We return to the distinction itself—between “impersonal law” and law by command and will-force. The author observes that the distinction may be only ideal, so far as the order of time and of fact is concerned. The precedence of law over government is only in the order of thought and of dignity. “There is really no real precedence in time, but only a precedence of rational order. Instituted government is to all created subjects of God as old as ideal principle, and they never had a moment under this, before coming under the other.” We accept this concession of the author, only observing in passing that it must inevitably follow that all created subjects of God must be sinners from the first, if as soon as they exist they find themselves under that “instituted government” which is of use only to redeem. But leaving this thought, we assert that this ideal distinction upon which everything depends is not correctly taken, and utterly fails to warrant the difference made between the righteousness and justice of God, and the relations of either to penalty and a required expiation. The ideal distinction we think is not correctly taken, for the following reasons. Right cannot in the mind of either Creator or creature be a purely impersonal relation. In its

very nature it involves a conception of authority, and authority supposes a person exercising government and imposing law. In the ideal state, before government is conceived to be instituted, even when there are no created subjects, there is still government and law, and possible penalty in every essential feature. We agree with the author that there is a "necessary, everlasting, ideal law of right which simply to think is to be forever obliged by it." But the question at once arises, What is it to be obliged? What are the elements and what the process? We answer, to be obliged, there must be an obliging person. In case that person be sole and single, the person obliges himself, imposes upon himself *as a law* the eternal relation which his mind perceives in his very constitution, and to the excellence of which he assents. We will not dispute the assertion of the author that moral distinctions are like those of space and time, and number and quantity. We are forward to add, as he does, that "it is the distinction of the moral Idea of Right, that it is the monarch principle of the soul. It puts all moral natures under an immediate indefeasible bond of sovereignty." But we add what seems to have escaped his notice, viz, that it can do this only as every moral person becomes a lawgiver to himself, imposing the idea upon himself as a law and holding himself to reward and penalty as the sure retribution. There cannot, even ideally conceived, be law before government. The moral law involves government, the self-government of the being who discerns it, whether he be God or man. Hooker well observes, first concerning the source of the moral relation, "The Being of God is a kind of law to his working for that perfection which God is, giveth perfection to that which He doth;" and again, "That law eternal which God Himself hath made to Himself, and thereby worketh all things whereof He is the cause and author." "Nor is the freedom of the will of God any whit abated, let, or hindered by means of this; because *the imposition of this law upon Himself is His own free and voluntary act*. This law therefore we may name eternal, being that order which God before all ages hath set down with Himself, for Himself to do all things by." In respect to created beings in that ideal state in which no "instituted government" is recognized, the Apostle declares, "these having not

the law are a law unto themselves." Nor is this a mere fiction of speech ; the government of a moral being over himself is the most effective of all governments, its law is the most potent of all laws, its sanctions are the most binding of all sanctions, its self-assigned rewards are the most winning, its self-inflicted punishments are the most terrible. By the same necessity and the same authority by which God reigns over Himself He will reign over others. He will not wait for sin to occur before He "institutes" government. As soon as moral beings begin to exist and are known to be existent, we ask and answer, in Dr. Bushnell's language, "is there anything that God will certainly undertake? His infinite righteousness contains the answer ; for by that He is everlastingly fastened in profoundest homage to the law, and almost as certainly to the well being of all moral natures related with Himself to the law. He will therefore regard Himself elected by His own transcendent powers of will and working to assume the charge of a Ruler and will institute government"—no, not institute a government in Dr. B's sense, but He begins to govern others by reënacting the law which they have imposed on themselves as the law which He imposes on them. This influence is not, be it observed, different in kind, only in degree, from that influence which He has used with Himself, and they with themselves. As He reigns over Himself by His sensibility to His own approbation or the reverse, so He reigns over others by their sensibility to the approbation of another being than themselves, ruling in all cases in the interest of moral rectitude, or it would be no moral rule at all.

The denial to God of this personal authority over others till sin requires its interposition, is a denial of God's essential rights as a person. The supposition that if there were no sin there would be no personal authority or will-force embarked, is essentially mischievous in its principle. It tends to, nay it symbolizes most intimately with the atheistic or pantheistic direction of modern thought—the one comprehensive and damning evil of its denial to God, of the reality of personal existence, and of the lawful exercise and influence on the universe of his personal authority and his personal rights. We quote gladly from Dr. Bushnell himself, the following passage as looking in

the opposite direction : "We do not like in fact to call it a government, for that is not relational enough to meet our feeling, but we drop the institutional conception, taking up the personal and calling it King—God is King, that is government enough, and we prefer to let our mind be occupied wholly with his royalties and the homage due to his attributes." We quote this for two objects—first, to attest that Dr. Bushnell would not consciously rob God of his kingly honor, and second, that in the name of those words of his we may ask his theory by what authority of reason or Scripture it refuses to accept God in this relation of governing King, in the ideal state of law before government and before sin. Is not God always a governing king?—with personal authority, with venerable law, by the very fact that He is naturally great and morally good, that is, by the glory by which He is the Living God?

We reject this fundamenal theory of Dr. Bushnell, as factitious in its inception, as superficial in its philosophy, as demoralizing in its operation, and as pantheistic in its affinities. But if the theory is untenable with the fundamental distinctions which it involves between law and government, between righteousness and justice, then the "conceptions legitimated by them," with respect to the cross and the work of Christ, must fail also.

2. Dr. Bushnell's conception of the nature of penalty is fatally defective. We ought rather to say he does not accept any conception of punishment at all as either supposable or necessary.

There is no room for punishment within the first condition of existence supposed by him, which is the sphere of impersonal and necessary right. He is logical enough to require none but to make the evil consequences of sin to be only "moral disorder." Under the second—that is, within the sphere of "instituted government"—there is evil in abundance. But as this evil is appointed for the ends of redemption from sin already incurred it cannot be penalty. These evils are called, indeed, by the author collectively "retributive causations," but the proper sense of retribution is not assigned them. They are all set forth as designed to chasten, to humble, to disappoint, to "mill and grind" the soul till it is brought into a con-

dition of attention and openness to the more ethical and gracious, the more spiritual and softening appliances of self-sacrificing and pardoning love. Even the eternal punishment which he describes, as first declared and clearly threatened by Christ, doesn't exclude the distinctive element of penalty, while the whole drift of the illustrations of its possible nature and of the answers to objections that might be urged against it, wholly excludes the conception of penalty proper. We may say with truth, that there is only a single sentence here and there of this entire volume in which the proper conception of penalty is recognized as possible, or accepted as real. All the reasonings of the author, both direct and indirect, would seem to authorize the conclusion that he holds no such doctrine, and scarcely knows what the conception is, as it is held and applied by others.

Penalty or punishment in the ethical sense of the word, as we understand it, is not physical evil alone, whether endured in the mind or the body of the sufferer. It is that peculiar pain which the soul suffers from the displeasure of a person for disobedience to his will. Any form of evil may be the means of expressing or impressing this displeasure, but the evil becomes penalty only so far it conveys personal displeasure. If the will is right, the person displeased is morally perfect; if the sufferer condemns himself, and assents to the excellence of the will of the person displeased, and his own desert of the displeasure expressed, then punishment is endowed with moral quality and is applied as a moral force. Any amount of evil not connected with moral ill desert, and not designed to manifest the displeasure of a moral person, is not moral penalty. Evil designed to reclaim, however much it may suggest his displeasure, if it suggests or conveys it as a monition to repentance, is not retributive but reformatory. Penalty, as a moral force, is also a force of the greatest moral dignity. It is used by all beings who have any sense of personal power or of personal rights. All men respond to it as an influence which may be rightfully exercised over themselves. That God should employ what is the essential element of punishment, viz, the expression of His personal displeasure, ought to be an axiom in theology. How far He may use it and for what ends, whether for

simple retribution in any case, or only for reformation, is a question that is fairly open to debate, but that this peculiar influence is one that is natural and legitimate ought not be an open question. That Dr. Bushnell has never recognized this truth except in the most incidental way, and has left out of his theories the commanding and distinctive element of punishment, is to us a matter of surprise. If he had given even a slight attention to that in punishment which gives it dignity and moral force, he surely could not have represented the motives derived from God's personal authority, and his expressed will, as appealing to the lower grade of sentiments, or as operating within the sphere of prudence and self-interest, and as therefore only secondary in rank and temporary in application. Certainly he would have made it appear more prominently as an element of the "retributive causations" to which the human race is subjected in the present life. He could not have failed to recognize it as bearing some share at least in that combination of evils assigned to the rejectors of the Gospel, which so unwittingly for his theory, but so truly for the fact, he describes by "a form of words having such vindictive energy that there is nothing, as far as I know, in all human language to match it—the wrath of the Lamb."

The non-recognition or the suppression of this essential element is but another example of the affinities of Dr. Bushnell's entire scheme with the pantheistic tendencies of modern thinking. Not only has God His rights as a person so far forth as to be entitled to rule His own universe by the force of law, but He is morally bound to exercise those rights in the use of His displeasure as a penal power. To deny this, or to fail to recognize this as an actual force in the moral universe, is to move in the direction away from the just recognition of God's personality. It is not chiefly to the existence of God as a person that the modern irreligionist objects, but it is to the use of His influence for moral ends in the way of interference and restraint that he feels most strongly opposed. To the necessity that God should be brought out from his infinitudes, and brought within human relations so as to be grasped by human thought, Dr. Bushnell has always responded, whenever he has insisted upon the incarnation as essential to an efficient the-

ism. He has strongly emphasized the necessity and power of the manifestations of God's personal love, in order that He may move and sway our human feelings. He has declared that this love must be self-sacrificing in order that it may reach the sensibilities hardened by selfishness and sin. So far he moves in the right direction. But when he denies or ignores those acts which give moral energy to the personality of God—acts of law and penalty—he moves in the direction opposite. He goes further when he ignores their dignity and their moral elevation. He goes still further when he dishonors these influences by making them address our lower sentiments. He degrades even the retributions which he acknowledges to meaningless inflictions of physical evil. In all these positions he sets himself strongly and surely towards the denial of the very relations through which God's personality becomes effective. He moves towards the abrogation of the most sacred rights, the most imperative duties, the most awful prerogatives that can be conceived as belonging to the personal Jehovah.

The theory of punishment adopted by any theologian must by a logical necessity determine his theory of atonement. The atonement is by its very nature an act which is designed to take the place of punishment. He who with Dr. Bushnell does not believe in the need of penalty as an expression of God's displeasure, must deny that atonement is either possible or necessary. He who holds that the infliction of so much positive evil, whether infinite in quantity or quality, is a vindication of justice, no matter whether it falls on the guilty or not, can easily construct a theory of the atonement by providing some substitute who is capable of suffering the penal evil. But the fiction or constructive act by which Christ is counted a sinner in order that he may be punished as a sinner, imparts neither ill desert to the sufferer, nor penal significance to his suffering. Where, on such a theory, can be the ethical value, where the moral significance of either penalty or atonement? The theorist who holds that "the emotion of anger against sin is constitutional to the Deity," which "God himself placates by a personal self-sacrifice that inures to the benefit of the creature," may call the emotion "ethical" and the propitiation a satisfaction of justice, but he does not thereby make the anger of God an eth-

ical sentiment, nor the penalty a moral power, nor the atonement a satisfaction of any moral claim.

It is singular that those who hold these theories, and are the loudest to talk about the necessity of vindicating justice, and of maintaining eternal principles, do in fact propound theories which have nothing ethical in their principles and which override the requirements of justice in their operation. They accept simple evil as an offset against the deserved penalty, no matter whether it falls on the innocent or guilty, no matter whether it does, or does not, express a displeasure that is deserved and just. In this penalty, as they conceive it, God as a person is not expressed—his feelings are not involved, his displeasure against the sinner is not illustrated, but his demand for so much suffering is simply appeased. These are the theologians who are so fond of charging against the theory which finds in both penalty and atonement a moral expression of God's personal character, "a theatrical inculcation of principles which were not truly involved in the case," and who say that "it degrades the infinite work of Christ to the poor level of a governmental adjustment, whereas it was the most glorious exhibition of eternal principles;"*—Principles indeed! What principles can be exhibited on their own theory except the principles of Shylock the Jew? But this brings us to another point.

3. Dr. Bushnell neither rightly understands nor successfully refutes the true theory of the nature and need of the atonement. This theory, when stated in its most general form, is, that Christ by his humiliation and his death did so manifest God as to make it morally possible to remit to the penitent and believing, the penalty which their sins deserve. It starts with a correct conception of the nature and ends of penalty, viz, that its value and force consists in this, that it expresses God as displeased with sin and the sinner. It proceeds to show that God by the humiliation and death of his Son, not only strikingly commends his redeeming pity for man, but does it in such a form and under such conditions that his love for holiness and displeasure at sin are made more conspicuous than if he had expressed them by punishment. This theory we hold to be the true theory, because of the positive statements of the Scrip-

* *Outlines of Theology*, A. Alexander Hodge.

tures; concerning the intent of the work of Christ, on the part of God; concerning its actual expression of both holiness and pity; concerning the conditions on which it is accepted; concerning the consequences to those who accept it in their acceptance with God for the present and future life, and in their triumphant peace and hope. It is sometimes objected that it makes the atoning work a mere expression. But those who thus object forget that all the facts and the goings on of the universe in their construction and development are but expressions or manifestations of One majestic person. All that he does so far as it has a moral significance or influence is but a language through which the invisible is interpreted by man. What exists by his fiat, and what occurs by his providence, are none the less realities because they are also expressions of God's spiritual truth, and God's moral feelings. Heaven is a fact in its fittings, its enjoyments, its rest, its society, its certainty of continuance, but it is because these all so constantly manifest and express the complacent love of the Redeeming God, that heaven has a moral force as the expected or enjoyed reward. What were its gates of pearl and walls of gold, if the glory of God did not lighten it, and the Lamb were not the light thereof. Hell may be dark and dismal in its fittings, and miserable in its companionships and hopeless in its prospects, but if God displeased were not ever flaming in lurid characters along its eternal vaults, its penalties would have no moral force. The atoning work of Christ is none the less a fact because its moral force is found in what it expresses of God. The humiliation to death of the incarnate Word is none the less a reality than the creation of the universe. The one expresses the moral earnestness of the eternal Word, and his redeeming pity to those who look upon the cross; as "the heavens declare" the wisdom and glory of the same Word, by whom they were made, and are continually upholden. Dr. Bushnell does not, it is true, urge the objection to this theory, that it makes the atonement an act of expression. Indeed it is in this connection, that there dawns upon his mind for a moment the thought that punishment may have what he conceives as a secondary import of expression. He observes in the sole passage

in which this thought occurs, "Punishment itself, apart from the matter of penal enforcement, * * * has besides a most sacred, noble efficacy in what it expresses of God—the determination of his will, his righteousness, in a word his rectoral fidelity to the law." As if *all* the penal efficacy of the "matter of penal enforcement," did not consist in what it expresses.

If it be conceded that the force of the penalty lies in what it expresses of God, then it follows that the effect of the atonement to release from penalty must also be found in what it expresses of God. Here two questions arise: Is there need of such an expression to release from penalty? Is such an expression possible by the humiliation and death of Christ? We need not raise the first of these questions, if we can satisfactorily answer the second. If it is possible that God can so manifest himself in the incarnate and dying Son as to accomplish the end which punishment is fitted to accomplish, then it is easy to believe that such an expression ought to be made. We need not discuss the abstract question of the necessity of an atonement, if we can show in what way an atonement can actually be made. The atonement may be assumed to be necessary if it can be shown to be possible. The question returns upon us, is an atonement in the sense defined, and by the means suggested, possible to be accomplished? This is the question to be asked, because we must confess this theory, and indeed every other theory, labors more here than at any other point. Many earnest thinkers hesitate to accept in full the "governmental theory," because they cannot clearly see what can be manifested of God by the incarnation and death of his Son which can make this death serve for the release from punishment. If now it can be shown that what is done and suffered does express the same moral purpose, the same feelings, the same character which the penalty was designed to manifest, then the three problems of the nature, the necessity, and the possibility of the atonement are all solved. Can this be shown? We think it can be shown to every mind that is willing to do justice to the entire import of the transaction.

It is not easy to illustrate the act and its import by any analogies drawn from civil government, from political society,

from human law courts, or any human institution or relation whatsoever. The reason is that the analogies, though real so far as the similarity holds, are too imperfect to serve the purpose for which they are employed. They all fail adequately to illustrate the grand and unique transaction which they are designed to explain. Not only do they fail to satisfy the mind, but the incompetence of the analogy and the poverty of the analogon, react to the disadvantage of the truth and principles involved. The weakness and ill-success of the attempt to do justice to a truth so great by an analogy so insufficient, become associated in the mind with the theory itself, in whose service the attempt was made.

The personages that are concerned, the interests that are involved, the transaction that is performed, the effects that follow, so transcend anything with which they may be compared, that to compare them at all seems to degrade the truths that are so explained. God, the Eternal King, reigns by a moral authority which transcends the rightful prerogative of any earthly sovereign. The Incarnate Word condescends by a humiliation which is beyond all imitation. The government is conducted for ends and in a spirit which no human administrator can even feebly imitate. The penalties are all personal in their meaning and binding force, and in this refuse to be symbolized by the operation of human punishments which are necessarily impersonal in much of their meaning and effect. The deliverance, in order to reach its aim, must respect not merely the outward actions, but the inner disposition of the man, an aim which no human administration has the appliances to reach, or the criteria by which to judge of success.

If we attempt to illustrate the atoning suffering and death by any human act, we cannot divest it of its human relations. Into the import of the death of Christ, then, must enter three altogether peculiar elements—the character of the being who suffers, the object for which he suffers, and the terms on which the suffering may be applied. That this import may be felt, the act must also be seen as the termination of the life of him who dies, and as the crowning event into which the significance of that life is gathered. It must also be rightly interpreted by and to the generation in which it took place, while the impres-

sions of all that it signified, are freshly made upon their souls. To understand the possible significance of the dying Redeemer we must needs study the event itself, not in its physical circumstances of sorrow and pain, but in all the elements which make up its moral import. The being who suffers, the life which his death finishes and explains, the object for which he suffers, the conditions through which his suffering becomes a deliverance, all these must be considered in order that this import may be understood. To do justice to all these elements of moral significance, we must go to the history itself, and learn to interpret it aright. The crucifixion is not a scene of physical suffering, a tragedy of agony and blood befalling a person of divine dignity, which may be set forth with circumstances of dramatic effect, and made to appeal to our physical sensibilities with moving pathos. The story of the cross, when thus recited in its physical detail by the graphic descriptions of the vivid preacher, or as represented so grossly by the Church of Rome, on Good Friday, by pictures and statues of the dead Jesus—ghastly, bleeding, betrayed, and suffering—is not the true story of the Cross, so far as it fails to give the moral import of the scene which grows out of the person, the object, the end, and the application of this death.

To learn these, so that we may rightly interpret the death of Christ, we turn from the weak analogies of human things to the event itself as it is sketched in the Gospels, and as it was interpreted to the living men who saw Christ die for their sins, and rise again for their justification.

The Word is made flesh. God is manifest in the flesh, yet he is not all at once manifest as God. He begins indeed as a child of rare innocence, and with a certain winning loveliness, which nothing but pure moral unselfishness can ever express. He passes through youth in ways of docility and obedience, with now and then a startling premonition of his divine relations and his coming mission and destiny. He is baptized and owned as the beloved Son of the Eternal by a miraculous attestation. He is introduced to his public ministry through a scene of temptation, and early learns to endure the contradiction of the sinners whom he would guide and save. He begins with teaching the elementary truths concerning the character which

befits the new Kingdom of Heaven. He exemplifies these truths in his own person, acting them out by look and deed, in the varied occasions of a public life which was tested by all manner of provocation, and of a private life that was open to the most prying scrutiny. His works of miracle attest his love and impress his teachings and support the claims which he prudently but firmly asserts. He gathers a circle of disciples upon whose rude yet receptive natures his character begins to make some moral impression that prepares them to respond to the radiance of his higher glory, as it shines forth more and more brightly through its earthly investiture. They believe that he is the promised Messiah—the Son of the living God—destined to be the Redeemer of Israel, the one who in their time should restore the Kingdom unto Israel. Bye-and-bye he intimates privately and quietly another destiny for himself—that he must suffer and be rejected, and be slain and be raised the third day. This they could not receive at the time, and it was reserved for the event to justify and explain the words. As he draws near to the crisis of his life, his love to his followers becomes more intense and spiritual, and the revelations of his higher nature become more full and unequivocal. The import of his coming death, as the power that should give life, and the means that should provide pardon, is more than once distinctly intimated. He dies; as he must die if he ventured into a world like this. He dies disgracefully, he dies by torture, as it was in keeping that he should. If he humbled himself so far as to become a man who should live for others he must be dragged down still further; if he displays such patient love he must expect to be struck upon the face; if he tries only to reclaim and recover he must expect to be spit upon and scourged. He could not show the excellence of such strange tenderness for others, without eliciting and illustrating by way of response the malignity of the sin from which he condescended to deliver. At last, as was befitting, the sinful generation and people and race to whom he came, and among whom he lived, did the worst thing that sin is capable of doing—they nailed him to the cross with malignant cruelty and scorn. But he is not overcome by death. He rises, and in the conquest which he effects over death he is shown beyond question to be the Son of God. His

divine nature is now attested, and this being attested, a new import is at once attached to his life and death. The radiance in which the risen Redeemer is now transfigured shines backward over his whole career, and puts a meaning into every part of it which could not have been dreamed of before. It shines forward, also, and explains how this sacrifice could be applied, by faith in it as a ground of acceptance with God. To know that this sacrifice would easily and naturally take such an import, we have only to take a step forward in the history. The same Redeemer who had risen as the attested Son of God, and ascended to the throne of eternal majesty, reappears in Jerusalem by a spiritual manifestation that startles the city and calls its astonished citizens together. Peter explains the miracle, and urges the argument that he whom they had crucified was indeed the promised Messiah, the now risen and reigning God. Those who are convinced of their malignant guilt are filled with terror at the thought of the deserved anger, the righteous punishment which they had incurred. They cry out, "What shall we do?" They saw in the act which they had done against the innocent and the just a manifestation of what they were, and they knew at once what they deserved. Can we be forgiven? Can we be saved? These are the inquiries which spring from their hearts and leap to their tongues. The answer is ready. There is one way, and one only, in which you can be pardoned. If you will come to the cross where you hung him, and take your pardon as a gift from him, and giving full faith to the teachings, the character, and the life of him whom you have crucified, shall confess him by baptism as your master and Redeemer, God will pardon you. Some gather around the place and, bitterly repenting of the sin by which they crucified him, do believe in him as the ground of pardon, and confess their faith in him as their Lord. Can any man doubt that as their forgiveness was accorded by God, on the ground of what Christ had done, with the hearty consent of those receiving it, that there is also a similar showing forth or manifestation of God, and of the same character in God, to that which would have been effected by the visitation of punishment upon the deed of guilt,—nay, which was manifested upon those who would not accept the pardon on those terms, and were doomed

to perish with their city and nation? Can any one doubt that the cross thus applied and accepted manifests "the severity" as well as "the goodness" of God? The scene speaks for and explains itself, when it is viewed in its elements and its application. It speaks the same truth to every generation which it spoke to the generation which killed the Prince of life. It is applied to all in the same import and upon the same conditions. It ever declares the moral majesty and the redeeming pity of our God.

The advantage of allowing the death of Christ to explain itself and suggest the true theory of the atonement, instead of illustrating it by some impressive scene or act from human history, is that in this way we see it with its natural accessories, relieved against a real background, and growing out of its legitimate antecedents. The death of Christ was a natural and necessary incident of his life. It was inevitable that such a being, living at such a time, should be crucified. That this death took place in such a way, and by such means, relieves our theory from the objection sometimes urged, that God is represented as contriving a spectacle of punishment for the sake of an impression of himself, in order that he might pardon sin. As we have viewed it, a part of the impression depends on the fact, and arises from the fact, that the death is a part of the life, of which it was the crowning event and fitting termination. If God was to be present in the flesh as a loving and condescending revealer of the Infinite Majesty, then, as revealed in the flesh, he must die a shameful death. Nothing but a miracle of ten legions of angels, or the presence of a chariot of fire to take him violently away, could avert such an issue.

If we regard the death as the culmination of the life, then all abruptness in the scene, and all impressions of effect, are at once removed. The death and life constitute a unity, and become the matter and medium of one manifestation of God. This enables us to do justice to the Scriptures, when they connect the life with the crucifixion and death as a continuous whole, forming a single impression, and tending to the same end. On the other hand, the death of Christ is invested with peculiar interest and made especially prominent as the ground of pardon. It is explained how, in the New Testament, the

death, the blood, the cross, are the ever prominent themes, because they gather into themselves and intensify the impression of the incarnation and life.

It may be objected that if the death of Christ was incidental to his life, then it could not be so essential as the condition of pardon. An event that occurred from the reaction of Jewish malignity could not, it is urged, have been so essential in the movements of God's administration as to be the turning point of the question whether or not man could be forgiven of God; and so the turning point of another question, whether God should interpose for his pardon; and so of another, whether or not the earth should be constructed and fitted up as a scene for man's recovery. To this we reply, first, the death, as has been shown, fitly ended the life of Christ. If he was to be incarnate, he would be crucified. The humiliation to the form of a man involved humiliation to the cross. Moreover, the one signifies the same as the other. The cross is only more intense and impressive in the degree. If an incarnation was contemplated as the ground or means of redemption, the cross must have been included. Second; what is last in its occurrence, and incidental and natural in its place and order, is often foremost in significance and fundamental in the divine economy. The tiny bud, the frail flower, the perishing fruit, the insignificant seed, are produced last in the order of time, and by the quiet processes of the life of the tree, but they are the dominant idea which rule over its existence—the overmastering end for which it is provided, and according to which it is trained. All the arrangements with respect to the tree, both divine and human, contemplate the production of the final fruitage that emerges without notice amid other more noisy and conspicuous demonstrations. Even so this death on the cross which occurred so naturally in the life of one who was apparently an unpopular Rabbi, the report of which occupied but a line or two in the dispatches of Pontius Pilate, was great enough, notwithstanding, to explain the Jewish economy of sacrifice which foreshadowed it; nay, to be set forth as the ground of God's forgiving grace to those sins which had been pardoned during all the centuries before. It was great enough to warrant the declaration, "there is none

other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved"—other foundation "can no man lay than is laid." To the interpreting and forecasting eye of the beloved disciple, when exalted by divine illumination—the divine sufferer is seen in the past as the Lamb of God, "slain from the foundation of the world;" and in the future ages his name is heard as the inspiring theme of that song of the ransomed in which is the ever recurring refrain, "Worthy is the Lamb."

The meaning of the incarnation and death must of necessity be kept back and out of sight, till the work is done. It could not be understood so long as he who had been in the form of God was obscured in the form of a man; but the instant he rose from the dead and was declared to be the Son of God with power—the instant that he stood forth in the glory of his higher nature, the Judge of men, the Lord of life, the Conqueror of death—then the import of the death as expressing God flashed into view, and the mystery that had been hid for ages was distinctly revealed. None of the princes of this world knew it, "for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory;" but when the act was completed, and the God who was in it stood forth, its import in all its aspects was revealed. The cross is explained as a way of pardon and justification, or rather the cross explains itself as soon as it is known Who hangs upon it, and for what He is there.

We observe, again, in this connection, that the death of Christ is more completely understood in its import as a manifestation of God, when it is consented to by the repenting faith of him to whose benefit it is applied. In other words, it can only become an atonement in the full import, when it is seen to have been designed to be accepted by every person who gains a release from penalty. It is not till it is received that God is fully vindicated, because the act is not fully understood till then. Were God to provide the death for the mere purpose of manifesting his severity, and without the understood condition that it shall be accepted by the grateful humiliation and consent of the pardoned, he would not be fully declared. But as soon as a single humbled and trusting offender accepts the gift, then all its import is revealed. We are well aware

that the objection might be urged that this would make the import of the provision and the fullness of God's gift depend on its being actually received, and also that it would involve some ethical content in the act of faith which accepts it; but we are content to take our view from the simple impressions left by the Scriptures, and to waive the opportunity to vindicate our assertion from every possible objection. We have room only to suggest that the consummated fact always reveals completely the designed effect. Objectively speaking, the act itself is complete on the part of God, and its import is really expressed, as soon as it is finished by the death, and explained by the resurrection of Christ. But when it takes effect by the faith of one believing soul, it is more clearly understood by the fruit which it bears and the end to which it is conducted.

The theory which we have given, as a theory that is at once Scriptural and tenable, Dr. Bushnell neither understands nor refutes. We have stated this theory in the most general terms, that it might be free from scholastic phraseology and from all theological and partisan associations. Dr. Bushnell rests the refutation of it which he attempts, upon the phraseology that is sometimes used, that God, by the death of Christ, expresses his "abhorrence of sin." Out of this verbal rendering he seeks to derive an argument thus: "Abhorrence is a word of recoil simply, and not a word of majesty. There is no enforcement, no judicial vigor in it." To this it is sufficient to answer in the same verbal spirit, that if there is no enforcement in simple abhorrence, there may be enforcement in abhorrence when the abhorrence is "enforced" by an expressive act. We do not assert that there is judicial vigor in it, for that the theory denies; but we do insist that the character is expressed which would become judicial vigor, if judgment and not pardon were required.

The second objection is, like the first, directed against the theory as "an abhorrence theory," and it lies "in the fact that no abhorrence at all to sin is expressed in the suffering and death of Christ." To this we reply first, verbally, that it is not abhorrence which is required to be expressed, but that character which would be abhorrence if abhorrence were the emotion called for; second, really, that the event, when con-



nected with the person enduring, the recovering love which animates the act, the object for which and the conditions under which it is applied, does speak forth both the holiness and mercy of God. The "severity is not laid upon him to be taken as the sign of his [God's] abhorrence," but it is laid upon Christ by man's malignity, and is voluntarily suffered by Christ in order that the sinner who has shown the malignancy of his sin in the deed, may be freed from the punishment which he deserves, by consenting to take pardon as the gift and in the name of the once incarnate sufferer whom he had rejected and slain, but whom his faith exalts as his rightful Lord and eternal judge.* We have already conceded that the decisive question in the case is the question of fact, whether God's severity is in fact expressed by the suffering on the cross when endured for such an end. The answer to this question is not to be gained by argument; it is furnished by the direct impression of the scene, when viewed in its moral completeness. That an obstacle to free and unconditional pardon actually existed is confessed by the conscience convinced of the fact and the evil of sin. That God removes it by the suffering of Christ is responded to by the same conscience, when the offer of pardon comes to it on the ground of that manifestation of God.

Dr. Bushnell does not correctly understand this theory in other important particulars. He conceives of it as a theory which has been accepted only in New England, within a century even here, and which has been known in no other part of the Christian Church. The New England divines have certainly done much to give it a perfected form, and to free the

* Dr. Bushnell contends that "the abhorrence theory" comes to the same thing at last as the "punishment theory," because the expression of God's feelings is made "on account of the law." But the one theory makes Christ to endure evil as a punishment—the other makes him to endure it that punishment may be dispensed with. The one makes the evil endured "a substituted punishment," the other makes it "a substitute for punishment." Dr. Bushnell himself makes Christ sustain "the rectoral honor" of God by submitting to "the retributive causations" in which man is implicated, and asserts that he came that he might, in reclaiming men, also accomplish this object. Did Christ, therefore, suffer punishment according to his theory? Let him apply the same rule to the theory which he criticises, which he will accept as just for his own.

propositions in which it may be stated from every possible objection, but it is a very serious mistake to suppose that the principles which underlie it have been accepted only in New England, and were not known in Theology before the New England divines began to explain the Christian system. The germ of this theory can be found in the reasonings of Anselm, along with the undeveloped germs of those theories which were matured by the divines of the second and third generation after the Reformation. We have the testimony of Baur and Neander that Anselm had not conceived the notion of a punishment incurred, or of a satisfaction rendered by suffering. The restoration of God's honor, and that not subjectively to himself, but also in the sight of the universe, was at least as prominent as the idea of expiation. This brings one part of his scheme into near connection with the so-called governmental theories. The treatise of Grotius, *De Satisfactione*, was an earnest protest against the doctrines of the Socinians, and a rational substitute for the more crude if not morally offensive explanations which so many of the Reformers adopted from the Scholastics. Notwithstanding the weakness of some points in the scheme of Grotius, and his ill reputation as a Remonstrant, his ground-principles wrought like leaven among all classes of Protestant theologians. We see the traces of it among the writings of the more rational Calvinists of the Puritan Party, as well as in the Church of England. Certainly the so-called New England theory is substantially received at the present day in England among multitudes within the established church and out of it, without a thought that it is of New England origin. The New School portion of the Presbyterian Church in this country once received it *en masse*, and were its most zealous advocates. The fact is recorded to their honor in the zealous fulminations against them which are to be found in the "Princeton Review," in the uncharitable denunciations to which their prominent divines and theological lights were subjected in the same journal, and it is engraved as with a pen of iron in the popular and clerical accusations which led to the excision of the Synods of Western New York, and to the division of the Presbyterian body. Whatever may be the theories of the atonement which are at

present taught in that denomination, the time was when this theory was universally accepted, and it was in that body the power of God unto salvation. It gave to it its aggressive energy, its manly spirit, its earnest piety, its rational yet Christian, its studious yet practical theology.

It may have fallen into some discredit of late here and there in New England, but not, as we think, with the men who represent the best type of the New England spirit. With those who seriously question its truth, from grounds of hesitating conviction, we have expressed our sincere sympathy. But such are not all who dispute it. Some may have contracted a distaste for it from associations that are purely factitious. Men who from philosophical pretension, or foreign culture, or superficial thinking, reject this view, will carry very little weight with their opinions. Mere *litterateurs* and *dilettanti* in theology may as well hold one opinion as another, so far as they themselves are concerned, and almost as far as those whom they influence. *Traditional* theologians who shape and modify their opinions by the authority of names, or the phraseology of creeds, may live in the past for themselves, but they cannot nourish the present by that which is gone, except so far as it teaches the ever living truth. Let the dead theologians whose faces look only to the past bury again the dead dogmas which they so carefully exhume, and would reinstate among the dwellings of the living. The *political* theologians, who shape their creed by considerations of ecclesiastical affinity, will not be likely to retain the New England theology, if their hearts do not cleave to the New England institutions. The *orthodoxical* [not the truly orthodox] theologians will, of course, prefer the old and well sounding phrases that mean nothing to the intellect but are imposing to the ear, especially if they can use them as a sounding brass, through which to proclaim their own superior zeal for the faith, or as forms of brawling accusation against those whom they would malign. But enough and more than enough of thoughts of this kind. The question is of little interest, who have taught this or that theory, or where it has been received, or whether it is called by one name or another. The only matter of importance is, what is true, and what can be defended by a sound philosophy and rational interpretation.

4. Dr. Bushnell is at fault in the most essential features of his theory of the sacrificial system and its symbolic import.

We say the most essential features of this theory—for with very many of his positions we heartily concur. We agree with him that the sacrificial system is natural to all rude nations, and that whether it originally sprung from divine institution or not, it could not have been accepted unless it satisfied a want in man's nature, and spoke directly to his heart. What this natural import is, should be gathered not from any possible accommodation of it to the work of Christ, or any typical foreshadowing which was found to be convenient or thought to be desirable, and therefore was assumed to be real. The sacrificial system could not serve as a system of types, unless it had a primary and obvious import of its own, which would qualify it to prefigure a spiritual reality; nor will the reasoning from any correspondence or fulfillment hold unless the system to be fulfilled had an import which corresponded in part to that which fulfilled it. Moreover, we concede that sacrifices, even sacrifices involving death, were used on occasions of thanksgiving and consecration, as well as those of penitence and the deprecation of evil. We hold with him that these acts of sacrifice constituted a symbolic liturgy which was used on every occasion, and was fitted to serve as the medium of every form of feeling and every attitude of worship. It was required by and for a people who had "not yet come to the age of reflection. They know nothing about piety or religious experience, as reflectively defined, preached, tested by words.

* * * Of course they are religious beings, guilty beings, but these deep ground-truths of their nature work out in them, from a point back of their distinctive consciousness; felt only as disturbances, not discovered mentally in their philosophic nature and reality. Now to manage such a people and train them towards himself, God puts them in a drill of action, works upon them by a transactional liturgy, and expects, by that means, to generate in them an implicit faith, sentiment, piety," &c., &c. All this we hold to be true and important. We know no theologian whose opinion is worthy of respect who would not assent to all these propositions.

From these general views, the author proceeds to lay down

what he considers the starting point or key-note to the entire system. "It begins at a point," he says, "or base note of action, that, so far as I can recollect, is wholly unknown to the *cultus*, or the sacrifices of any heathen religion. Moving on results of purity or purification from sin, it supposes impurity, and lays this down as a fundamental figure, in what may be called the footing of ceremonial uncleanness. Then the problem is to cleanse or hallow the unclean." This, and nothing besides, Dr. Bushnell thinks to be indicated by the Mosaic ceremonial and the sacrificial system. In other words, lustration or ceremonial cleansing, as symbolizing inward purity, is "the fundamental figure" which exhausts the entire import of this system. When ceremonies are employed to make pure that which is by the law unclean, when garments are changed, when water is sprinkled, when the victim is slain, over whom the priest had confessed the sins of one or many, and the blood is applied to those in whose behalf the victim was sacrificed—the whole import of each and all of these acts is expressed in the phrases to make inwardly pure and holy.

Of these points of the theory, as thus far explained, we observe that simple lustration is not unknown to the heathen ritual, would scarcely be denied. If we mistake not, it figures very largely in their ceremonies. Water, and fire, and incense, and all manner of preliminary rites, figure very prominently in these systems. We agree with the author that in those rites it is not specially significant of inward purity. On the contrary, lustration or ceremonial cleansing signifies in the heathen rites only *consecration and acceptableness to the Deity*. Uncleanness of person or apparel, of the place and implements of worship, is offensive, because it is displeasing in itself, and because it betokens irreverence. This shows why it gave the fundamental figure to the ceremonial of the Jews. The Jews were taught to regard themselves as a chosen people, "a Kingdom of Priests," a holy, i. e., a consecrated nation. Hence, they were to be choice in their food, in their personal habits, in the thousand minute particulars of their ritual and manners, by which they were to be ever reminded of their special relation to God. When they had become unclean, when by accident or design they had broken these rules, they were to be

made clean again by appropriate ceremonies of lustration. Acceptableness to God, a state of rightness or favor with God, justification even, were much more directly suggested than purity of heart, even by what Dr. Bushnell takes to be the grand conception of the sacrificial system, viz., the conception of lustration or cleanness. It is true that inward purity was afterwards evolved, but not to the exclusion of the first and leading conception. Even the order of suggestion from the physical to the moral was not that indicated by Dr. Bushnell. *Cleanness* meant first physical cleanness, next acceptableness to God, or rightness with the ritual, next freedom from whatever is offensive in transgression, whether the sin were external or internal. The loss of God's favor enters always as an element into the idea of uncleanness. This thought has greater importance than it seems to have at first, to any one who follows it out in the explanation of the kindred words which are used in the New Testament. To cleanse from sin, whether ritual or moral, suggests first the idea of the restoration of God's favor, and second the idea of internal purification.

Psychologically considered, also, the consciousness of guilt is in fact developed to the consciousness far earlier than that of the inward pollution of sin. That which in the order of time first awakens the soul to reflection upon and the discernment of moral distinctions, is the discovery that we have displeased others. We then ask ourselves is their displeasure reasonable or unreasonable. This puts us upon the efforts of inquiry whether we ourselves approve or disapprove our own acts. So in our relation to God, guilt, ill-desert, danger, are the conceptions which are first evoked and prominently expressed. The pollution of sin is a conception which comes later still, and so far as it is distinguishable from personal ill-desert, it signifies the degradation of the soul, from its high destiny, its base subjection to animal and irascible passions, and its entangling servitude to evil habits. Even when this conception is matured and developed, it by no means displaces or removes the sense of guilt or ill-desert from ourselves and from other good beings, and above all from God.

But should we admit that lustration or ceremonial cleansing had respect to the inward purification only, it would be diffi-

cult to see how the application of the blood of a slain victim could be limited to express inward cleansing, except by a sense which is obviously secondary and plainly derived.

But before we pursue this point further, we ought to consider positively whether the offering of a slain victim did not necessarily symbolize the confession, on the part of the worshiper, that his sin deserved an evil like that which his victim incurred. It is no answer to say that the taking of life in ordinary cases signified nothing to the Jews, nor that the pain attending the slaughter would not awaken a responsive feeling in the minds of a pastoral people. The question is not whether these evils and pains would be noticed in ordinary, but whether they could be left unconsidered in extraordinary circumstances. We know when covenants were made among the earliest and rudest tribes, that animals were slain by or in the name of both the contracting parties, and that the act was understood to declare that each invoked upon himself the fate of the slaughtered victims in case he should be false.* In all such cases death, painful death, is actually made to signify deserved evil. In this spirit and sense Moses ratified his law as a covenant with the people, by sprinkling the blood of calves and of goats, and saying "this is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you."† If slaughter could symbolize to a rude people evil possibly or really incurred in the case of a covenant, it could do the same in the act of sacrifice.

Upon Dr. Bushnell's theory we cannot see the import of the application of the blood of the victim by sprinkling the worshiper. In blood there is nothing physically cleansing; it is only as the blood to a rude people is the most obvious physical symbol of the mysteriously departing life, and as the sprinkling of this blood upon the participants is conceived of

* The form which was used among the Romans in making the oath, when a swine was sacrificed, was: *Si prior defexit (populus Romanus) publico consilio, dolo malo, tu illo die Jupiter populum Romanum sic ferito, at ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam; tantoque magis ferito, quanto magis potes pollesque.* Livy, 1, 24, 8; compare also 9, 5, 8. Compare Genesis xv. 8-24, for the vision of Abraham, in which the visible symbol of Jehovah, translated "a smoking furnace," &c., passes between victims that were slain to bind the covenant.

† See Hebrews ix. 19, 20, and Exodus xxiv. 5, 6, 8.

as connecting them most intimately with whatever purpose the slaughter of the victim signifies, making the victim, so to speak, to be their own, that we can explain its application at all. But if, in the case of the sin or trespass offering, there was signified the infliction of evil such as the offerer confessed he deserved, and the cleansing by blood meant the removal of deserved anger as well as the moral cleansing of the soul, then the application of it is natural and easy to be understood. It is far too refined a construction to say with Dr. Bushnell that it signifies the "sacred, mystic, new-creating touch of life." For a rude people such a conception is plainly too refined; to a cool critic it would seem to be only a dexterous conceit, used to dispose of the obvious import of the passage, "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that maketh atonement for the soul."

Nor does it prove anything to the contrary of these views, to assert that slaughtered victims were offered on other occasions besides occasions of expiation. It is true they were. Animals were slaughtered, and placed upon the altar, and burned with incense to serve as thank-offerings, as well as to express the confession and to relieve the fears of the guilty. The use of animal sacrifices, for all the occasions and acts of worship, was most natural as it was universal, for reasons and by tendencies which need not be explained. But this by no means justifies the inference that they could not naturally and legitimately also become the symbols of expiatory needs and deprecatory feelings, nor that when they served this use, the death, and sufferings, and banishment of the victim did not come distinctly into view and signify substituted evil.

This argument, which is so strongly urged by some modern German critics and theologians, and which is pressed so confidently by Dr. Bushnell, seems to us not only to fail, but to be entirely inconsistent with a proper historic estimate of the extensive import and varied uses of the sacrificial system among those tribes and nations to whom such a system constituted the only liturgy for all occasions and needs.

We should like to follow Dr. Bushnell in his remarks concerning "Atonement, Propitiation, and Expiation." But

our limits will not allow. The principles upon the subject which we have urged, must serve in the place of a more particular discussion and criticism of his arguments and opinions.

It would seem, perhaps, that we ought to devote a formal refutation to the very elaborate argument which Dr. Bushnell has bestowed upon these three most important topics, especially in consideration of the very confident assertion which he makes in the following words: "I am able, after the most thorough and complete examination of the Scriptures, to affirm with confidence, that they exhibit no trace of expiation. * * * * That such an opinion has been so long and generally held of the Scripture sacrifices, I can only account for in the manner already suggested, viz, that there is a natural tendency in all worthy ideas of religion to lapse into such as are unworthy—repentance, for example, into doing penance—that the sacrifices could easily be corrupted in this manner, and, in fact, were by all the pagan religions; and then, that there was imported back into the constructions of holy Scripture a notion of expiation, as pertaining to sacrifice, under the plausible but unsuspected sanction of classic uses and associations."

The whole force of this assertion and of the nine reasons which Dr. Bushnell adduces to prove its truth, depends entirely on whether he has rightly seized upon the fundamental conception which is expressed by the sin offering under the Jewish system. This was not, as we contend, "inward cleansing," but rightness with God—or justification—on the objective ground that evil was deserved by the worshiper and endured by another. The subjective or spiritual condition of acceptance which the act of offering symbolized, was indeed that repenting faith which involves inward purity. The heathen notion of expiation began with the same fundamental conception; but the need of sacrifice was interpreted by superstition to proceed from malignant anger on the part of the cruel deities, in place of the just displeasure of the Holy Jehovah, and to require on the part of the worshiper the costly and painful sacrifice perhaps of the fruit of the body for the sin of the soul, instead of the broken and contrite heart. But does this perversion of heathen superstition exorcise truths that seem to be

recognized on every page of "holy Scripture;" which have molded and inspired all its diction, and are made the subject matter of its most precise definitions and its most elaborate arguments, such as we find in the Epistles to the Romans, the Galatians, and the Hebrews? Dr. Bushnell must excuse us; we are not convinced, we are not even moved by either his assertion or his arguments, except to wonder!

We cannot silently pass over the view which is earnestly pressed by the author in respect to the use which is to be made of the "molds of thought for the world's great altar-service in Christ," in our devotional conceptions and public preaching of the work of Christ. "In the facts outwardly regarded, there is no sacrifice, or oblation, or atonement, or propitiation, but simply a living and dying, thus and thus. The facts are impressive, the person is clad in a wonderful dignity and beauty, the agony is eloquent of love," [Why not of something more?] "and the cross a very shocking murder triumphantly met, and when the question rises, how we are to use such a history so as to be reconciled by it, we hardly know in what way to begin. How shall we come unto God by help of this martyrdom? How shall we turn to it, or turn ourselves under it, so as to be *justified* and set in peace with God? Plainly there is a want here, and this want is met by giving a thought form to the facts *which is not in the facts themselves*. They are put directly into the molds of the altar, and we are called to accept the crucified God-man as our sacrifice, an offering or oblation for us, our propitiation; so to be sprinkled from our evil conscience, washed, purged, purified, cleansed [Why not justified here as well as above?] from our sin." "And so much is there in this that without these forms of the altar, we should be utterly at a loss in making any use of the Christian facts, that would set us in a condition of practical reconciliation with God. Christ is good, beautiful, wonderful; his disinterested love is a picture by itself, his forgiving patience melts into my feeling, his passion rends open my heart, but what is he for, and how shall he be made unto me for the salvation I want? One word—he is my sacrifice—opens all to me, and beholding him, with all my sin upon him, I count him my offering, I come unto God by him, and enter into the holiest by his blood."

We have copied so much of this passage in order to be perfectly fair to Dr. Bushnell in allowing him to speak for himself. The passage strikingly reminds us, in its intellectual coherence though not in its moral spirit, of the position taken by Strauss and Hennell when at the close of their destructive criticisms of the facts of the Christian history, they ask, what then? Must we cease to be Christian believers? Must we cease to receive these facts of history in some sense as true? To these questions of their own asking they reply, not in the least; though they are not true in fact, we must talk, and act, and feel, as though they were,—we must incorporate them into our festivals, prayers, and sacred songs,—“we must give a thought form to the facts which is not in the facts themselves.”

The reason given by Dr. Bushnell why we must give “a thought form to the facts which are not in the facts themselves,” is that we require some objective molds into which we can project the phenomena of our conscious experience, so as to avoid an “over-conscious,” a too introverted occupation with our subjective experiences. That is, if we concern ourselves too exclusively with the subjective goings on of our souls—“their moral disorders” and their inward relations of purity—we shall have no objects from which to derive the inward purity for which we seek. This is true, and the truth reaches out far more widely, and strikes far more deeply in its application to his entire scheme, than Dr. Bushnell seems to dream. But let it be granted as it will be by all, that some objective form must be had into which the soul may project itself, and from which it may draw inward strength and purity, the question still returns, how can you find such a form in the sacrificial system, if that system means no more in its natural and original import than he allows? How could the sacrificial system become the altar form of Christian thought and feeling and expression in all ages, unless the system itself suggested an import of facts and objective relations which is fitted to promote and excite gratitude, love, and “inward purity?” Dr. Bushnell asserts that this system served as the “transactional liturgy” of a rude people, because they desired to offer their best to God and on occasions of ceremonial uncleanness were told to slay a victim and sprinkle his blood. It might serve as such

a liturgy so long as the rude custom of sacrifice should remain, or the positive law of priest, ruler, or deity should require it. But when we are called on to adopt it as the objective vehicle of our Christian worship, then we inquire what is it fitted in its nature to express, and what is the real import of Christ's work, which we wish to express through it? According to Dr. Bushnell, the work of Christ means only a sacrificing act of love in God which stoops to our miserable and suffering condition that we may be won to purity and love. And what did the victim slain upon the altar signify to the Jew? Why he offered his best to God, as he had learned from his fathers, following also the blind impulses of a childish nature, or God had told him when he sinned to slay a victim and to be sprinkled with its blood; the use of the victim signifying the inward purity, that the ceremonial cleansing might suggest to the reflecting mind. When now we have learned all about this inward purity, and also have learned the substance of the gospel to be that Christ loves us, and longs to make us pure, how can we use the shell out of which the kernel has so completely fallen? Of what use is the shell to us? It expressed nothing to the Jew in the way of natural significance; how can it express anything to us? How can we make the lamb slain upon the altar an object into which we project our spiritual feelings or our dependence upon God? But if it were true that the dying lamb did signify to the Jew that there was evil deserved for which the evil that fell upon the victim was substituted, and if the blood of the lamb when applied to the penitent signified that he might be accepted on certain conditions, we can see how it could furnish a language for all Christian worship. And if we may believe that Christ by the evil which he suffered made it consistent that God should forgive, we can see also how the lamb that was slain and the blood that was sprinkled should become the altar forms after which the believing and the praying Church on earth must express its prayers for forgiveness, and the ransomed Church in Heaven shall phrase the songs of its eternal praise. That Dr. Bushnell has unconsciously taken the same view, we must believe, when he says, in the words already quoted, "but what is he for, and how shall he be made unto me the salvation I want? One word—

he is my sacrifice—opens all to me, and beholding him with all my sin upon him, I count him my offering, and come unto God by him, and enter into the holiest by his blood?"

There are two remaining points of weakness in Dr. Bushnell's scheme on which we had proposed to offer some remarks; viz, his view of justification by faith and his special interpretations of the declarations of the Scriptures. Of the first we desired especially to say something, that we might explain what that faith is which is the condition of justification, and how this faith is required to complete and explain the atonement, and also that we might show that under Dr. Bushnell's theory, justification cannot be distinguished from the inward cleansing or sanctification, despite his earnest and ingenious efforts to separate the two. We had desired also to explain the several conceptions of the word "righteousness," so often used in the New Testament and so strangely perverted in some systems of theology. But we pass over these topics for want of room.

Of the declarations of the Scriptures we must say a word. These declarations concerning the import of the work of Christ are so various, and so decisive, that we find it difficult to see how they can receive but one interpretation. They speak directly of its design in terms too clear and decisive to be set aside. They speak indirectly of its operation in a great variety of assertions, all consistent with each other, and with only one conception of the leading design of this death. They do not, it is true, with scholastic nicety, confine themselves to this one relation or end. Often this leading relation is entirely omitted through the desire to emphasize some other, but that the Scriptures do teach a doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice in the sense commonly received, as well as in that to which this phrase is singularly limited by Dr. Bushnell, is to our minds most clear. Had we no theory of the atonement by which to explain its reasonableness and its justice, and were we entirely unable to answer Dr. Bushnell's arguments or to expose the weaknesses of his counter-theory, we should at least rest assured, in the words of Channing, "that the Scriptures ascribe the remission of sins to Christ's death, with an emphasis so peculiar that we ought to consider this event as having a special influence in removing punishment, though the Scriptures may not reveal the way in which it contributes to this end."

Dr. Bushnell's interpretations are all to the opposite conclusion. We had proposed to examine some of them, but our limits will not allow us to do so at present. Perhaps on some future occasion we may show that his interpretations of special passages are as untenable as is the philosophical theory which made them necessary.

There are two passages, however, which we cannot pass over, they seem to us so decisive of what was preached by the apostles in respect to the design and import of the death of Christ. These are Rom. iii. 19-26, and 2 Cor. v. 18-21. In the first of these passages the starting-point is the thought that all are condemned and pronounced guilty. No mention is made of the pollution of sin. It is not even hinted at, so absorbing and overwhelming is the consideration of the ill-worthiness of the human race. The next thought is that a way of deliverance from this condition and of transference into another, is clearly manifest, being effected by believing in Christ. Then Christ himself is spoken of as taking the place of the old propitiatory offerings. Christ, to become effective, must be received with faith, as these offerings were made effectual by the sprinkling of blood. The design and effect of this provision is to manifest in these last times that the past forbearance of God, in remitting sins committed in the previous ages, had been on grounds of justice, the death of Christ being all the while respected as the ground of this procedure. This thought the apostle dwells upon, and repeats it again, 'this is what I intend, that God has set forth Christ as a sacrifice, that at this time of the world's history his justice might be vindicated, in all his acts of justification, whether past, present, or future.'

This interpretation is, we believe, in the main correct. Not only is it sustained by the careful study of the words and the grammatical structure of the sentences, but it is required by a consideration of the logical relations of the parts of the passage to each other, and to the whole argument of the Epistle. Any other interpretation fails to meet these conditions of truth.

The second passage is interesting, as it purports to be an explicit statement of the import of the gospel which the apostle was accustomed to preach. God is through or by means of Christ reconciling the world of sinful men to him-

self; but in what does the act consist? in not imputing their trespasses unto them. But what is this? Does it mean no more than that he imparts to them inward purity, or that he gives them that favor of God which they had forfeited? Which of these two thoughts is expressed in the apostle's words, or was in fact in the apostle's mind? Who can doubt that there was but one thought in his mind and which of the two was that one? This is made more clear, if possible, by his summary of the message of entreaty "in Christ's stead" "be ye reconciled to God." Here the responsibility is thrown upon the men addressed, of bringing themselves into that relation to which they were invited. The argument gathers strength when the reason for their compliance is added. 'For he hath made him [Christ] to be treated as though he were a sinner, to the end that he might treat us as though we had never sinned.' Into the effect described in the words "that ye might be made the righteousness of God in him," the additional import may enter that they also might be made really righteous or "inwardly pure," but this is not the consideration prominent in the mind of Paul.

It would seem that no more clear, precise, or decisive explanations could be asked for or given, respecting the "vicarious sacrifice," than are furnished in these two passages.

We cannot bring to this abrupt conclusion our remarks upon what we regard the oversights and errors of Dr. Bushnell, without a single additional observation. While he contends most earnestly against the doctrine of the atonement as it is usually received, he contends as earnestly, that Christ has most amply sustained the rectoral honor of God, and deepened the impressions of men concerning his essential holiness. He has done this by sanctifying the precept of the law by his personal obedience, by threatening eternal judgment and perdition in a manner and in terms most awful and impressive, and by suffering all the corporate evils as well as the retributive causations under which the race exist. His exhibition of these truths are very earnest and impressive.

It seems then, after all, that Dr. B. contends as earnestly as any that an expression of God's holiness must be made as well as of God's mercy; that God's rectoral honor must be upholden as truly as his vicarious love; and that Christ most effectual-

ly accomplished these objects. He only differs from us by denying that this expression was directly made by the incarnation and death, or that these are set forth as the ground of possible pardon. These express only tender love and pity. The work of Christ *as a whole* provides for an honorable ground of pardon, but not the humiliation of Christ to the cross. Christ does sustain God's rectoral honor, and thus provides for the propriety of pardon. But it is not by the great act of condescension unto death. This illustrates only the mercy of God.

He rejects the doctrine of a required expiation because his philosophical scheme provides no occasion for it, because, as he asserts most distinctly, there is no possible antagonism between justice and mercy, which makes an atonement necessary or even possible. How incorrect and untenable these assumptions are we have endeavored to establish. Into what defective interpretations of the Scriptures this philosophy has led him, we might more fully have shown, had our limits allowed.

The practical conceptions, however, which he everywhere exhibits of the place which Christ should hold in the soul of man, of the power which he is fitted to exert over his moral being, of the completeness of man's dependence upon him for all his salvation, and of the free grace from which this salvation proceeds, cannot be mistaken nor overlooked, except by those whose creed is more Christian than their justice or their charity. No one of our living writers can be easily named who gives to Christ a higher place, or who ascribes to his supernatural Incarnation and Work a larger honor, than does Dr. Bushnell. No one can be named who has taken nobler and more comprehensive views of the completeness of Christ for every exigency which he recognizes. No one can conceive more vividly the tenderness, the sublimity, the subduing and constraining power of his self-sacrificing and vicarious love. No one certainly can draw out by a finer analysis the workings of that love upon the soul of man to purify and humble, to elevate and ennoble, to sanctify and save his ruined nature. It is singular, remarks an acute critic in a private letter, that men who, like Bushnell and Robertson, reject the full import of the death of Christ, should make Christ a far more living and effective power than the majority of those who receive it. It is singular, yet, it must be confessed, it is true.

While, then, we reject the theory of Dr. Bushnell as falling short of the fullness of Scriptural truth, we recognize, with the utmost satisfaction, that he reaches substantially the Scriptural view of Christ's work in every possible practical application which may be made of it to the soul of man. In one view the prayer with which he concludes his book might be construed as a piece of unconscious irony perpetrated by himself upon his own theories. In another and more Christian construction, it ought to be regarded as the confession of the truth in which the heart is far more orthodox than the head. We think none the worse of our Congregational system that it enables us by its free and charitable spirit to recognize such a man as we know him, and as all the world knows him to be, as a Christian preacher with whom we may hold fellowship, while at the same time it allows us freely to discuss and refute the errors of that philosophy which has so seriously misled him in the interpretation of the teachings of Scripture in respect to one of its most important doctrines.

ARTICLE V.—THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CONNECTICUT.

The History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, from the settlement of the Colony to the death of Bishop Seabury.

By E. EDWARDS BEARDSLEY, D. D., Rector of St. Thomas Church, New Haven. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

WE are under no temptation to speak otherwise than kindly of Dr. Beardsley's History of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut. We cannot but respect the author's attempt to trace the origin, the early difficulties and embarrassments, and the growth of the ecclesiastical body with which he is personally connected as the rector of an Episcopal congregation in New Haven, and as counting among his ancestors some of the earliest Episcopalian dissenters from the established church-order of the colony; and we are happy to testify that the result is creditable not only to his diligence and carefulness in collecting, and his skill in arranging and combining the materials of the story, but also to his candor and Christian catholicity of spirit. It would be preposterous to expect from him such a history of Connecticut Episcopalianism as a Congregational pastor might have written. Recognizing him as an Episcopalian not only by inheritance and education, but also by personal conviction, and by the associations and sympathies of his religious experience, we cannot demand of him a perfect impartiality. We would honor him instead of blaming him for the undisguised affection with which he regards the subject of his story, and for that filial reverence toward his ecclesiastical forefathers which enables him to find heroes and confessors where we might not have thought of finding them.

Nor do we deem his work unfit for other than Episcopalian readers. A man of whatever ecclesiastical connections, who would be really intelligent in respect to the church history of New England, must be willing to see the events and actors of that history not only in one light, but also in all the cross

lights that may be thrown upon the picture. If he is a Congregationalist, he should be willing to see what version an intelligent and candid Episcopalian, or even one who is not quite candid, will give of the story told by Mather and Trumbull, and so many other biographers and historians in the same line of traditionary sympathies. Might not a Wesleyan see some things in the religious history of New England which, but for his assistance, an Edwardean might not see? Might not a Baptist, on the one hand, or a Presbyterian, on the other hand, see some things which an admirer of the Cambridge Platform would be likely to overlook? Might not a German scholar, trained under Neander—as, for example, Uhden in the work entitled “the New England Theocracy”—open new views and indicate new lines of inquiry concerning our history? Doubtless Uhden has made some grave mistakes; but for all that, his book is not without its value to us. So a Presbyterian, or Baptist, or Wesleyan historian would be very likely to err in his interpretation of documents or of admitted facts, but he might help us, notwithstanding his errors, in our interpretation of the same facts or documents. Let us be willing to learn whatever lessons the past can give us through whatever interpreter.

In a strict use of words, the history of Episcopalianism in Connecticut begins at Stratford in 1705, or two or three years earlier. Very properly, however, the first chapter of the work before us undertakes to describe the “settlement of New England and the religious liberty established by the Puritans.” But inasmuch as the Puritans who settled New England did not undertake to establish, and did not in fact establish, anything like “religious liberty,” in the present acceptance of the phrase, the title of that chapter might be censured by capricious critics as a misnomer. We have no such criticism to make. We know how often the loose declamation of orators, intent on glorifying New England, has claimed for the Puritan fathers of Massachusetts and Connecticut a merit which they never claimed for themselves, and which belongs rather to the Ultra-Separatist father of Rhode Island. Our author, therefore, need not be censured for attempting to show that “the religious liberty established by the Puritans,” whether here, or

in England and Scotland, was not by any means such a religious liberty as is now demanded for all men everywhere in the name alike of Christianity and of philosophy. When Endicott came to Salem with the expedition under his command,—when Winthrop and the great emigration of 1630 followed, bringing with them by a bold assumption of authority the charter of the Massachusetts Company, and transferring from London to New England the government of its colony—when Thomas Hooker and John Haynes, with the congregations that recognized their leadership, traversed the wilderness from the Bay to the River,—when John Davenport, Theophilus Eaton, and “all the free planters” at Quinnipiack, “assembled together in a general meeting to consult about settling civil government according to God,”—they had in view no scheme of absolute and universal religious liberty. Their end in coming to this country was not at all the religious liberty of Papists or Episcopalians, of “Familists” or “Anabaptists,” of Quakers or any other possible sectarians not then in existence, but simply freedom for themselves to worship God according to their own conscience, and to set up those ecclesiastical institutions which they believed to be of divine authority. In the words of “all the free planters” at New Haven, “they held themselves bound to establish such civil order as might best conduce to the securing of the purity and peace of the ordinances, to themselves and their posterity, according to God.” In England there was liberty for a full and exact conformity to the Church of England, as then by law established; but they wanted liberty for conformity to the New Testament. In Virginia there was the same liberty as in England, but no liberty for any deviation from the canons and rubrics of Anglicanism. The fathers of New England intended that in their colonies there should be liberty for something for which there was no liberty either in England or in Virginia—something which was not the church of William Laud and Charles Stuart—something for which they had made very considerable sacrifices, and which in their view was the worship and ecclesiastical order originally instituted by Christ and his Apostles. They did not know, as we now know, that when founding these Congregational churches, and these town-

ship governments, they were planting here germs which, if not destroyed, would yield at last among their ripened fruits absolute and universal liberty of conscience. They did not pretend or expect to establish what we call "religious liberty;" but out of what they established there came even for Episcopalianism a liberty and independence of the secular power which Episcopalianism in England has never yet obtained for itself.

Dr. Beardsley falls into a more serious error when he tells his readers that the first settlers of New England were under no necessity of leaving their native country in order to obtain their own religious liberty. His words are, "It can hardly be said that the early settlement of New England sprung from any necessity to avoid direct religious persecution in the mother country." p. 7. "Even the pilgrims of Leyden, who separated from the [established] Church, and with their future pastor, John Robinson, fled from the north of England in 1608, without doubt 'purely for the purposes of religion,' might have returned a few years later and enjoyed comparative liberty." pp. 7, 8. Comparative liberty! What kind of liberty was that? Was it liberty to be anything else than conformist members of the Church of England, without incurring legal penalties? Our author distinctly admits that in England the sort of people who founded these States had something to endure. He says, "Their grievances were great. Their sufferings were severe enough to irritate them, and bring lasting disgrace on the government," "*but*," he adds, "*they did not destroy life*." Is this what he means by "comparative liberty?" Does he hold that sufferings inflicted on account of religious opinions and practices, be they ever so severe, are not "direct religious persecution" unless they "destroy life?" He illustrates his meaning by assuring us that "there was no burning at the stake in England, nor persecution unto death in any form for the sake of religious opinions and practices, after 1611." In other words, when he says that the Leyden Pilgrims might have returned to England and "enjoyed comparative liberty," he means only that they might have returned without any fear of being burned alive like the Protestant martyrs under Queen Mary, and without knowing certainly that they would be hanged like the Congregationalist

martyrs under Queen Elizabeth. Had he told us what great change in the laws and government of England took place at the date of 1611, his idea of "comparative liberty" would have been more clearly brought out. Had he told us what the laws of England were at that time in relation to Non-conformists within the state church, and in relation to Separatists from the state church, his readers might have been better able to judge in what sense he should be understood to deny "that the early settlement of New England sprung from any necessity to avoid direct religious persecution."

Episcopalianism in Connecticut originated, partly, in certain tendencies which Dr. Beardsley, looking at the subject from his ecclesiastical position, could hardly be expected to recognize. Although the settlers of New England were quite unanimous in renouncing the distinctive government and ceremonies of the English church establishment, as it then was and now is, there was in some of them a tendency which for some reason obtained in Connecticut an earlier and ampler development than elsewhere. It is often said that at first there was a Presbyterian element in New England; and our New School Presbyterian friends, who are far from being Presbyterian in the sense which that name had two hundred years ago, love to insist upon the story. The truth of the story is, that there was among the founders of these States a tendency to what may be called the National theory of church order, in distinction from the Congregational. . Presbytery in Scotland, and Prelacy in England, were only two different forms of constituting and governing a national church. The Puritans, properly so called, accepted the National theory; they believed that there was a church in which all the baptized people of England were members, and which needed more reformation than had been granted by Queen Elizabeth. Deformed as the national church was by ignorance and superstition, they regarded themselves as members of it, and as bound to labor for its reformation. The Separatists, on the other hand, had generally rejected the theory of Nationalism in all its modifications, and had adopted instead the primitive theory of Congregational Churches, independent of the civil state and of each other, and each divinely invested with full power to re-

form its modes of worship and discipline according to the mind of God revealed in the Scriptures. The Puritan's great aspiration was to reform the national church to which, in what were to him its superstitions and corruptions, he could not conform. The Separatist having renounced all national churches as irremediably and essentially antichristian, and having learned the possibility of "reformation without tarrying for any," undertook, without leave from crown or mitre, to institute in England not another national church, but simply Congregational churches, as the Apostles did in the Roman empire without asking leave of Caligula, Claudius, or Nero. In New England, the differences between Puritan and Separatist, which had been sharp and painful in the mother country, disappeared, and the churches instituted by the voluntary union of believers were Congregational in form. But within thirty years from the settlement of Boston, the differing tendencies, or ecclesiastical polarities, which in England had produced Puritanism on the one hand and Separatism on the other, had begun to reappear in other agitations and controversies.

The old colony of Plymouth, with its Pilgrim Church, which became in some sort the mother of all our churches, was a Separatist colony. Massachusetts was predominantly Puritan. In the New Haven jurisdiction, though the leading men had never been Separatists before their migration, the principle of discrimination between the church and the civil state was thoroughly understood and strictly maintained. "Ecclesiastical administrations," said Davenport, "are a *divine* order appointed to *believers* for holy communion of *holy* things. Civil administrations are a *human* order appointed by God to *men*, for civil fellowship of human things." "Man, by nature, being a reasonable and social creature, capable of civil order, is, or may be, the subject of civil power and state. But man, by grace, called out of the world to fellowship with Jesus Christ and with his people, is the only subject of church power." This is more than mere Puritanism. It is the very radicalism of the Separatists from all national churches. Accordingly the records of the New Haven Colony, down to the time of its absorption into Connecticut under the charter

given by Charles II., show very little trace of a tendency toward Nationalism as distinguished from simple Congregationalism. But in the colony on the river it was quite otherwise. There the distinction between "ecclesiastical administrations" and "civil administrations" was less carefully observed; and the history of that colony, from the beginning, shows by many indications the working of a tendency toward Nationalism in the relations between the churches and the civil government.

To illustrate this, let the reader, if the volumes happen to be within his reach, open the published records of the two last mentioned colonies. Of the New Haven archives there are two volumes,—the first containing the "Records of the Colony and Plantation of New Haven, from 1638 to 1649," the second containing the "Records of the Colony or Jurisdiction of New Haven from 1653 to the Union" in 1665. Each of these volumes has a very full index. Turning to the index of the first named volume, we look in vain for the words, "ecclesiastical," "church," "minister," "elder," or any other reference which might imply some cognizance of ecclesiastical questions by the civil government, with the single exception of the reference to that often asserted provision of the civil constitution in the colony, "Church-members only to be free burgesses." We look into the other volume, with a similar result,—the one exception being in this case the reference to the "ecclesiastical laws." The "Public Records of the Colony of Connecticut, prior to the union with New Haven Colony," have been published in a single volume with a similar fullness in the index. As we open this volume to see what the civil government of the colony on the river had to do with the churches there, we find that "ecclesiastical affairs" are conspicuous. The references under that title in the index are very numerous, and when we turn to the pages indicated, we find all sorts of interferences with the administration of the churches—interferences which sometimes seem to have had the very natural effect of giving additional acerbity to contentions which they could not pacify. We cannot but regard that frequent interference of the secular power in ecclesiastical concerns as proving that the predominant influence in that colony,

from the beginning, was infested with the spirit of Nationalism in distinction from simple Congregationalism. If the Christian people in all the places within a certain jurisdiction are the church of that jurisdiction, then obviously the Christian government which represents those Christian people may be expected to express its judgments and opinions on ecclesiastical questions, and to do so (if occasion arises) in an authoritative way.

Out of that Presbyterianism or Nationalism, came the great controversy which began in the Hartford Church after the decease of its renowned Pastor, which spread with its agitation into Puritan Massachusetts, but which found no place in the New Haven Colony till after the union with Connecticut. The personal issues in which the controversy began at Hartford have passed into oblivion; but, aside from all personal antipathies, there was a conflict of principles and tendencies which could not be adjusted, and which outlived the persons concerned at the beginning. What those conflicting tendencies were, appears from the sequel of the story. Probably the leaders in the dispute hardly knew the reach or the root of the questions disputed; nor why it was that a controversy which at first was local and personal could not be settled, but overcame all endeavors at pacification, and drew into its growing vortex not only the neighboring churches but the neighboring colonies. In all that fermentation, the leaven of Nationalism (then called Presbyterianism), which came over not with the Pilgrims but with the Puritans, was working. We may marvel at the questions which were sent from Connecticut to Boston for advice, and which were discussed and answered in one Council and another; for it is difficult for us at this day to put ourselves exactly into the theological and ecclesiastical position of either party. But when we see historically what the system was into which the churches of New England lapsed after the conclusions of the Synod of 1662 had gradually prevailed, the whole matter becomes intelligible. John Davenport seems to have understood the drift of the movement better than most of his contemporaries. He described the innovating party as "hoping that the plantations shall be brought into a parish way." When the colony which he had

founded, and which under his influence had steadfastly adhered to the original and simple Congregationalism, was merged in Connecticut, his complaint was, "In New Haven Colony, Christ's interest is miserably lost;" and at the call of the First Church in Boston, which had not yet accepted the conclusions of the Synod, he went to stand there against the tide of Presbyterian innovation, and to fight over again in his old age the battle which he had fought almost thirty years before at Amsterdam, where he had his Presbyterian colleague, Paget, for an adversary. But the tendency of the times was mightier than he; and Massachusetts, as well as Connecticut, was "brought into a parish way." In Connecticut, especially, the name of Congregationalism began to be repudiated. The dissensions in the Hartford Church were at last terminated by the legislature permitting the minority to withdraw and become a distinct church, expressly because of their desire to "practice the Congregational way." Significant intimations were given that a new system was coming in; "the Congregational churches of these parts" having been formerly approved only "for the general, of their profession and practice," and being still permitted to remain "without disturbance" in the expectation of "better light." In other words, the leading men of the colony, including those who constituted the government, and perhaps a majority of the ministers, were steadily tending toward an ecclesiastical establishment on the principle of Nationalism. The local church, as a covenanted brotherhood of souls renewed by the experience of God's grace, was to be merged in the parish; and all persons of fair moral character, residing within the parochial bounds, were to be, as in England and Scotland, the members of the church.*

Of course the soil was all the while becoming prepared to produce another variety of Nationalism, and the seed was at hand and abundant. Church-of-Englandism was a very natural result of that reaction against simple and scriptural Con-

* The ecclesiastical reaction in New England, and especially in Connecticut, near the close of the seventeenth century, is treated more at length in the *Historical Discourse on the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the General Association of Connecticut*. See "*Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of Connecticut*," pp. 14-32.

gregationalism and toward an ecclesiastical establishment dependent on the State, which brought in the "half-way covenant," with its sacramentarian practices, and whatever else pertains to the "parish way." Already the Church of England was virtually the established Church in the neighboring province of New York, and if there was to be in Connecticut an ecclesiastical establishment on the principle of Nationalism, why should it not be conformed to the national church of the mother country. Already the North American colonies were regarded as a field in which a great work might be done for the Church, and the "Society for the Propagation of the Gospel" was chartered for that work. It was well understood that to bring these colonies into an ecclesiastical conformity with England would greatly promote the loyalty and permanence of their dependence on the crown; and the royal governors of New York were doing whatever their power could do, to show that the English conquest of that province from the Dutch had brought in the Church of England; and that English ascendancy was the ascendancy of the English prayer-book, and the English hierarchy, no less than of the English language. Nothing was more natural than the spreading of Episcopalianism from New York into Fairfield County in Connecticut. The intercourse, commercial and social, between the towns on Long Island Sound and the growing emporium at the mouth of the Hudson, brought into that part of the colony an influence steadily adverse to the old order of things. From the moment that New Amsterdam became New York, the royal power, with the pomp and prestige attendant on a royal government, was nearer to Connecticut than it had ever been before. The almost independent self-government instituted by the founders of the colony, and confirmed by a charter from King Charles II., had become precarious. Its dissolution, and the reduction of the people into an immediate and entire dependence on the crown, were confidently expected by all malcontents, and eagerly helped on by those who thought that under royal governors, like Andros and Cornbury, the chances for them would be better than under the self-government of a Puritan people.

Dr. Beardsley describes, in such terms as might be expected,

the beginning of Church-of-England worship at Stratford, to which place the recent emigration, consequent on the acquisition of New York, seems to have brought several English families. His account agrees with that given by Dr. Trumbull, but is illustrated with details and extracts from contemporaneous documents. Trumbull says: "Some of the people at Stratford had been educated in the Church of England mode of worship and administering the ordinances; and others were not pleased with the rigid doctrines and discipline of the New England churches." Afterwards he adds, "The churchmen at first, in that town, consisted of about fifteen families, among whom were a few husbandmen, but much the greater number were tradesmen, who had been born in England, and came and settled there." (History of Conn., Vol. I., p. 477.) Dr. Beardsley says: "The communication between this and the mother country had become so frequent, that merchants and traders, as well as artisans and planters, were invited hither by the promise of rich gains; and of these adventurers the Church of England had a fair proportion of representatives in Stratford." p. 17. Both historians recognize at this point the distinguished agency of a certain Colonel Heathcote, in effecting the introduction of the Church of England into Stratford. Trumbull describes him only as "a gentleman zealously engaged in promoting the Episcopal Church." Dr. Beardsley calls him "a distinguished layman, the Hon. CALEB HEATHCOTE, a Christian gentleman, loving most warmly the Church, and sustaining high and important responsibilities in the New York government." He quotes from a letter of this distinguished layman and Christian gentleman a few words, which can hardly fail to excite in the reader some desire for a further acquaintance with the writer.

To illustrate, therefore, that particular episode in our ecclesiastical history, the introduction of the Church of England from New York into Connecticut under the strategy of Colonel Heathcote, we give a larger account than our author found himself required to give of the letter from which he quotes. Our copy is in the "Documentary History of New York," Vol. III., pp. 117-128.

The letter is addressed to the Society for the Propagation of

the Gospel, and is dated "Manor of Scarsdale, Nov. 9, 1705." It might be called an official letter, for the author begins by expressing his thanks for the honor of having been elected a member of the Society, an honor at which he was "wonderfully surprised." It is a methodical and business-like reply to certain official inquiries :

"If I mistake not, the several heads you desire satisfaction of, in both your letters now before me, are—First, an exact and impartial account of all your ministers; secondly, what fruit may be expected from Mr. Moore's mission: thirdly, what my thoughts are of sending Mr. Dellius into those parts again; fourthly, my opinion of the Society's having appointed that good man, Mr. Elias Neau, as catechist," &c.

On the first of these points, the Colonel reports very favorably. The Society was at that time only four years old, and its missionaries were as yet few—five or six in the province of New York; the rector of Trinity Church in the city of New York not being one of them. Col. Heathcote says:

"I must do all the gentlemen which you have sent to this province that justice to declare that a better clergy were never in any place, there being not one among them that has the least stain or blemish as to his life and conversation, and though I am not an eye-witness to the actions of any save those in this county, [Westchester,] yet I omit no opportunity of enquiring into their behavior, both of the friends and enemies of the Church, and they all agree as to the character of the gentlemen, and that they use their best endeavors to gain over the people. And as to their diligence in the faithful discharge of their trust, the Society, I hope, will in their instructions have laid down such rules as they won't fail coming at it without being imposed on."

Having mentioned two missionaries on Long Island, and another on Staten Island, he repeats the caution that whatever information he gives concerning them, and any others out of Westchester County, is only at second-hand, "which is often very uncertain." "Some gentlemen," he says, "may, many times, and very deservingly, have a fair and good character by the generality of their neighbors, and yet at the same time, by one misfortune or another, not perform much of the service of the Church. Of this he gives an instance in the missionary at Westchester. Mr. Bartow, whom he certifies to be a "very good and sober man," and "extremely well liked and spoken of by his parishioners in general;" but who, though he had been three years in that parish, had not, with all that good reputation, been successful in making proselytes. "Not many in that

parish," says the Colonel, "are added to the communion, nor baptized, and few catechised."

He digresses to tell of a project which he had favored for dividing the county, which seems to have been at that time one parish, into three parishes, and for assessing, in the place of £50 on the whole county for the support of one minister, £70 on each of the three parishes for the support of three ministers. The scheme had been defeated for the time, apparently by a vigorous opposition from the people of Westchester, among whom Mr. Bartow's three years of missionary labor had produced so little fruit; but the proprietor of Scarsdale Manor proceeds to show that, "had they permitted that projection to have taken place, it would have been a great ease to the Society." First, the additional £20 which Mr. Bartow would get from the taxes might be deducted from his stipend as missionary, and be so much clear gain to the Society's treasury. Secondly, a comfortable provision would be made for Mr. Bondet, a French Protestant minister, who was "in orders from the Bishop of London," and by whose help the Huguenots of New Rochelle might be brought over to the Church of England. Thirdly, the Independent minister at East Chester, Mr. Morgan, would have become an Episcopalian, (for he had promised to do so), and then there would have been no "hopes of any dissenting minister getting footing in his place."

To illustrate the equity of his "suggestion," for quartering three Episcopalian ministers on the county of Westchester, the Colonel, with great simplicity, states the fact that in a district which, (if we understand him), was to be one of his three parishes, and in which the taxable property was less than half as much as in the town of West Chester, the people had actually paid voluntarily to ministers of their own choice more than the £70 which he proposed to assess upon them, for the support of a Church-of-England missionary. "There is no parish in the government," quoth he, "but what is able to pay twice as much as they do. For Rye parish, which is not by one-half so large as the least parish established by law in the government here, since my living here maintained two dissenting ministers, viz, one at Rye and Mamaroneck, and one at Bedford, and gave the former £50 and the latter £40 a year,

which I think makes it out very plain what I have offered on that head." He admits, however, that something will depend on the expected missionaries—they must "take pains and bring the people into a good opinion of the Church."

In this connection, he mentions a rumor "that the Queen [Anne] would be at the charge of maintaining a suffragan bishop in these parts." If that were done, he doubts not that "many who had their education in Boston College would conform, and would be content with the benefices as settled by Assembly, without being very burthensome to the Society."

After commending very highly Mr. Muirson, "whom my Lord of London has sent to this parish," and declining to make any distinct report concerning the missionary in New Jersey, he says:

"My principles and natural temper lead me to do the Church all the service I can everywhere, but I dare not promise for more than this county at present, and my best endeavors in the westernmost towns of the Connecticut colony when the Church is well rooted here. And it has always been my opinion, and it is so still, that there is no part of this province, or even America, that would be of greater use or service to have the Church thoroughly settled in, for it is not only large in extent, and the land very good, and near the city, (so consequently will be in time a great settlement), but, bordering on Connecticut, there is no part of the continent from whence the Church can have so fair an opportunity to make impressions upon the Dissenters in that government, who are settled by their laws from Rye parish to Boston colony, which is about thirty-five leagues, in which there are abundance of people and places. As for Boston colony, I was never in it, so can say little to it. But for Connecticut, I am and have been pretty conversant, and always was much in their good graces as any man. And now as I am upon that subject, I will give you the best account I can of that colony.

"It contains in length about one hundred and forty miles, and has in it about forty towns, in each of which there is a Presbyterian or Independent minister settled by their law, to whom all the people are obliged to pay, notwithstanding many times they are not ordained, of which I have known several examples. The number of people are, I believe, about 2,400 [24,000] souls. They have abundance of odd kind of laws to prevent any dissenting from their Church, and endeavor to keep the people in as much blindness and unacquaintedness with any other religion as possible—but in a more particular manner the Church, looking upon her the most dangerous enemy they have to grapple withal. And abundance of pains is taken to make the ignorant think as bad as possible of her. And I really believe that more than half of the people in that government think our Church to be little better than the Papist. And they fall not to improve every little thing against us. But I bless God for it, the Society have robbed them of their best argument, which was the ill lives of our clergy that came unto these parts. And the truth is, I have not seen many good men but of the Society's sending.

"And no sooner was that honorable body settled, and those prudent measures taken for the carrying on of that great work, but the people of Connecticut doubting of maintaining their ground without some further support, they with great industry went through their colony for subscriptions to build a college at a place called Seabrook. And the ministers, who are absolute in their respective parishes as the Pope of Rome, argued, prayed, and preached of the necessity of it; and the passive obedience people, who dare not do otherwise than obey, gave even beyond their ability. A thing which they call a College was prepared accordingly, wherein, as I am informed, a commencement was made about three or four months ago. But notwithstanding their new college here, and old one in Boston, and that every town in that colony has one and some two ministers, and [I] have not only heard them say, but seen it in their prints, that there was no place in the world where the Gospel shone so brightly, nor that the people lived so religiously and well as they, yet I dare aver that there is not much greater necessity of having the Christian religion in its true light preached anywhere than among them; many, if not the greater number among them, being little better than in a state of heathenism, having never been baptized nor admitted to the communion."

Having illustrated the terribly unchristened condition of Connecticut, by some statistics from the two towns of Rye and Bedford, which had formerly belonged to that colony, though they were now beginning to share the benefits of the New York government with its English Church establishment, he comes to the question of "the best and most probable way of doing good among" a people so heathenish. In his view, the introduction of the Church of England into the benighted region east of Byram river, "is the most difficult task the Society have to wade through." His plan of invasion is best given in his own words:

"I believe for the first step, the most proper way would be that one of the ministers in this county were directed by my Lord of London to inform himself where there are any in that government that profess themselves to be of the Church, and to know if they or any of their neighbors have any children to baptize, or desire to partake of the sacrament, and that he will come to the towns where they live, and after having given them a sermon, will perform those holy rites. There need, I think, be no more done in this matter at present. But the Society may, if they please, leave to rest the me, and I won't only give him the best advice and directions I can therein, but will, God willing, wait upon him in his progress, and persuade some useful friends along with me. And when this essay has been made, I shall be much better able to guess at the state of that government, and what is fitting to be done next. Now the person that I would advise them to pitch upon, by all means, for this expedition, is Mr. Muirson, he being not only posted next to those parts, and so will look less like design, but he has a very happy way of delivery, and makes little use of his notes in preaching, which is extremely taking among those people; and for argument, few of his years exceed him."

Notwithstanding so long a digression into Connecticut, the voluminous letter does not close without touching upon the other topics announced at the beginning. "Mr. Moor's mission" was a mission to the Indians—very proper, one might think, to be undertaken by an institution founded and chartered professedly "for the Propagation of the Gospel." But Colonel Heathcote says: "As for my opinion in that matter, I think it is too heavy for the Society to meddle with at present, and would properly lie as a burthen upon the crown to be defrayed out of the revenue here." Their being "brought over to our holy faith" would secure them in their fidelity to the government, and therefore the cost of converting them ought to be defrayed by the government. He adds that the Society will "find employment enough for their money in sending of missionaries amongst those who call themselves Christians on the coast of America." "As for Mr. Dellins," who seems to have been sent, on some occasion, among the Indians, his case is briefly disposed of. "Mr. Neau," who had been appointed catechist to the Indians and negroes in New York, is commended; and with three pages more of miscellaneous matters, the letter comes to an end.

Probably the reader feels himself, by this time, pretty well acquainted with Colonel Heathcote. It would be wrong to suppose that his professed affection for the Church of England was not real, or that he did not feel all that contempt for Christianity separate from Episcopalianism which breathes through this voluminous document. Much more would it be wrong to suppose without evidence that the writer was not a man of integrity, veracity, and a reasonably good character in other points of morality. We assume—and doubtless all candid readers not informed from other sources will assume—that he was in his way a devout man; that in the manor-house of Scarsdale Manor, there were religious observances, such as the saying of grace at table, and the reading of prayers; that Sunday was kept there, not indeed with a sabbatical strictness after the Puritan fashion, but with a cheerful abstinence from week-day labor, with the catechising of servants and children, with the reading of perhaps a chapter out of *The Whole Duty of Man*, and with the best dinner of the week; that among the

tenants and laborers, on the Colonel's domain, gross vices were discouraged by his influence and his example; that profane language, if uttered in his presence, was rebuked; that the poor of the neighborhood were kindly cared for, especially if they were not guilty of joining in worship not in conformity with the Established Church; that young people of the lower order were instructed in their duty to their superiors, inferiors, and equals, but chiefly to their superiors; and that Col. Heathcote, take him all in all, was quite a model specimen of the English country gentleman in the reign of Anne—a Sir Roger de Coverley enlarged and dignified by military experience, and by participation in the government of a province. Assuming all this, the religious character of that distinguished layman and Christian gentleman is an interesting study. It is of a type that was common amid the general laxity of faith and morals throughout England in those times, and that is by no means extinct on either side of the Atlantic in these days. We may pause to look at it.

The religious character manifested, unaffectedly and unconsciously, in the letter from which we have given large extracts, is not simply, nor is it directly, the faith of Caleb Heathcote in the Divine person of Jesus Christ the Saviour of sinners and the manifestation of God to men; but faith, devout and unreserved, in the Church of England personified as of the feminine gender, faith in *her* authority, *her* ministry, *her* sacraments; full faith that if his soul is in *her* keeping, it cannot be lost. We are not saying that he did not at all believe in God the Father Almighty and in Jesus Christ, but only that his faith rested first and absolutely on that concrete institution, the Church of England, as by law established. He may have believed in Christ, and in all the articles of the Apostles' creed, for the reason that his faith in the Church being an implicit faith in whatever the Church believed in, must needs be an explicit faith in whatever he understood of her doctrines, and we are not denying that such faith, imperfect and blear-eyed as it is, may have been sufficient for the saving of his soul. What we are insisting on is the fact that there was then, and is still extant, a type of religious character which is distinguished by believing primarily in a certain visible Church,

and secondarily in Christ, because that Church believes in him. Such a faith may make a devout Churchman; but at the best it makes only a narrow Christian, who has never learned the meaning of that precept, "Beware of the concision." To our thought, Col. Heathcote's letter illustrates, fairly and favorably, that type of religious character.

Religion of that type is intensely sectarian in its genius—though of course there are many other kinds of sectarianism. Beginning with a devout faith not in God the Father, nor in Christ the Son of God, nor in the Holy Spirit, nor in any cardinal point of spiritual Christianity, but in a certain organization considered to be feminine and maternal, and represented by her functionaries and her ritual—or, if you please, by her judicatories and her standards—it cannot climb high enough to look over the barriers which the organization has built around itself, or to acknowledge ingenuously, and with no disheartening consciousness of inconsistency, the existence of a living Christianity outside of those walls. Evidently this was the type of religion at Scarsdale Manor. In the eyes of Col. Heathcote, those who worshiped God in Christ otherwise than according to the ritual of the Church of England, however well provided with ministers of their own choice, and however established by law in a region which they had planted for that very purpose, were on a level with the wild heathen in respect to spiritual need, and required hardly less than Mohawks and Oneidas the charitable interposition of a Society instituted for the purpose of "propagating the Gospel." The same type of religion in our day, whatever its denomination may be, is associated with the same proselyting spirit. How can it be otherwise? If "our Church" is the way of salvation, then every dissenter, though he be ever so devout in his way, and ever so confident in Christ, must needs be "brought over to the Church" in order to be saved. Is not that just the spirit in which Col. Heathcote proposes to invade Connecticut? Has he any thought of making converts to Christ, or does he think only of making proselytes to the Church?

At the same time, we shall hardly be just to Col. Heathcote if we do not observe the connection between his religion and his politics or statesmanship. The Church of England, in the

conquered provinces of New York, was part of the new political system which came in with the conquest. Just in proportion to the success of "the Honorable Society's" missionaries, not simply in propagating the gospel, but rather in "gaining over the people," the military conquest would be confirmed and completed by a moral conquest; and the dependence of the province on its new mother country would be more willing and less precarious. Such being, partly at least, the stimulus of the Colonel's zeal for the Church of England in his own province, it was natural for him to feel that, in reference to the same ends, the same work was equally important in the neighboring colony. How could that colony be truly English without the English ecclesiastical establishment? As he looked toward the east, and thought of that Puritan commonwealth stretching a hundred and forty miles along the coast, with "about forty towns in each of which there was a Presbyterian or Independent minister settled by law"—a region with "abundance of people and places," but disowning the ecclesiastical establishment of England and the jurisdiction of my lord of London—the sight was as offensive to his loyal English sensibilities, as the sight of Mordecai sitting in the king's gate was to the pride of Haman. An English colony without the acknowledged ascendancy of the English Church, without the surplice and the ceremonies, without the sign of the cross in baptism, and without the prayer-book, but full of psalm-singing and unwritten prayer, and thoroughly supplied with Calvinistic preachers—why the thing was not to be endured! It was as a political institution and for political ends, that the Church of England was to be carried into Connecticut. We may say this without imputing to Col. Heathcote and his coadjutors anything like hypocrisy. Assuming that he was a religious man in his way—as religious as Laud, or, to take a more modern instance, as religious as Bishop Staley of Honolulu—we must not forget that certain political principles were part of his religion, the religion with which he endeavored to satisfy the craving of his spiritual nature being essentially related to the state and royal government of England. His religion being faith in the Church of England, the *first* object of his faith was not a personal God and Saviour,

but a certain ecclesiastico-political institution personified. Unable to recognize any thing better than cant and fanaticism in what pretended to be Christianity without conforming to the Church of England, he was equally unable to recognize any true loyalty which did not worship at her altars. It was not merely as a religious man, zealous for the propagation of the gospel in its purity,—it was also as a loyal man, zealous for Queen Anne's headship over the Church, and as an Englishman zealous for the ascendancy of the mother country over the colonies, and for a complete conformity in the colonies to all English institutions except English liberty—that he planned the invasion of Connecticut by missionaries of "the Honorable Society."

We find an illustration of this Christian gentleman's political views and aims, and of his way of thinking about the relation between England and her colonies, in a letter of his to the Board of Trade under the date of August 3d, 1708. Referring to certain proposals which he had made to their Lordships in preceding letters, he says :

"What in the first place I aimed at by my proposals was, to have diverted the Americans from going on with their linen and woolen manufactories, [manufatures], and to have turned their thoughts on such things as might be useful and beneficial to Great Britain. They are already so far advanced in their manufactories, [manufactures], that three-fourths of the linen and woolen they use is made amongst 'em, especially the coarser sort, and if some speedy and effectual ways are not found to put a stop to it, they will carry it on a great deal farther, and perhaps, in time, very much to the prejudice of our manufactories [manufatures] at home. I have been discoursed with by some to assist them in setting up a manufactory [manufacture] of fine stuffs, but I have for the present put it by, and will, for my own part, never be concerned in that nor anything of that nature, but use all the little interest and skill I have to prevent it." *Doc. History of New York*, I., 712.

A letter of a somewhat earlier date, from Lord Cornbury, Governor of New York, to the same Board, touches on the same subject, and helps us to understand what were the principles and aims of the Councillor as well as of the Governor. His Lordship thinks that with proper encouragement the people of his province might supply England largely with naval stores ; and his argument is,

"The want of wherewithal to make returns for England sets men's wits at work, and that has put them upon a trade which I am sure will hurt England in

a little time, for I am well informed that upon Long Island and Connecticut they are setting up a woolen manufacture, and I, myself, have seen, serge made upon Long Island that any man may wear. Now, if they begin to make serge, they will in time make coarse cloth, and then fine; we have as good fuller's earth and tobacco pipe clay in this province as any in the world. How far this will be for the service of England, I submit to better judgments, but, however, I hope I may be pardoned if I declare my opinion to be that all these colonies, which are but twigs belonging to the main tree (England) ought to be kept entirely dependent upon and subservient to England, and that can never be if they are suffered to go on in the notions they have, that as they are Englishmen, so they may set up the same manufactures here as people may do in England, for the consequence will be that if once they can see they can clothe themselves, not only comfortably but handsomely too, without the help of England, they, who are already not very fond of submitting to government, would soon think of putting in execution designs they had long harbored in their breasts. This will not seem strange when you consider what sort of people this country is inhabited by." *Doe. History of New York*, I., 711, 712.

We find ourselves beginning to plough, a little deeper than Dr. Beardsley was required to go, into the subsoil, among the roots of Col. Heathcote's zealous propagandism. The reasons why the introduction of the Church of England into Connecticut seemed so important, were partly religious and partly political, or rather—if we may use a compound word to describe a compound thing—they were politico-religious. A great question between old England and New England, between the ideas and interests which controlled the government at Westminster—and the ideas and interests that had been planted on this side of the Atlantic, was looming up in the distance. For what end did these colonies exist? What was their legitimate relation, not to their mother country merely, (for the kingdom of England, whence their fathers came, was now, by the Act of Union, merged with Scotland in a new monarchy), but to the greater and more imperious nationality of Great Britain? The men who settled New England had come hither, not at all with the idea that the political communities which they were founding, and the broad lands which they were redeeming from the wilderness and annexing to the domain of civilization, were to exist for no other purpose than that of supplying naval stores to Great Britain, and raw materials for the English manufacturers, but rather with the inspiring idea that here they were to find a home for themselves and their posterity, and a new realm for

the dominion of Christ. Their expectation was that the price which they were to pay in the form of privations and hardships, would be repaid abundantly to their descendants in the form of religious and social advantages as well as of augmented wealth. They intended that their children should have better churches, a better ministration of the gospel, a better social order, better laws, a more general diffusion of knowledge, better restraints, and a better liberty, than they were likely to have in England. Instead of expecting that the relation between the country from which they came out and the colonies which they were founding, would be simply the relation of ownership and dominion on one side, and of absolute dependence and subserviency on the other, they regarded this as their country from the moment when their feet first pressed its soil. Without renouncing their nationality, they intended to leave behind them all the municipal regulations of England, all that was the distinctive *lex loci*, but most of all the ecclesiastical establishment and ecclesiastical laws, and to bring with them nothing of their native country but its language, its Bible, and its characteristic spirit of order and liberty. Assuming that the local law of England had no more authority over the king's subjects beyond the Atlantic, than it had over the same king's subjects beyond the Tweed, they regarded themselves as Englishmen out of England, governed by the law of the land to which they went, and which was to be, thenceforth, as really their country as Scotland was the country of Scotchmen. As the *Magna Charta*, with all the conglomerate of concessions, privileges, and traditions, since the Norman conquest, was supposed to be the protection of Englishmen in England against the otherwise absolute power of the king, so they assumed that their own royal charters (where they had them), together with the concessions which they might gain in their distance and poverty, and the usages and traditions which they might establish, would be, in their own new country, their protection against the natural rapacity of kings and courtiers. All this was diametrically opposite to the notions prevalent at Westminster. Even the wisest of British statesmen at that period had hardly formed any higher conception of a colony or other outlying portion of the empire,

than as a means of increasing the wealth and commercial greatness of the imperial island. The English revolution of 1688, and the subsequent union with Scotland, had established in Great Britain the ascendancy of those classes and interests which were represented in Parliament, and the question how the colonies should be governed, and for what ends they existed, became a question between the colonies on the one hand, and the ruling classes in the mother country on the other hand. When the province of New York was wrested from the Dutch republic, the change of government created of course an English party made up of placemen, traders, and their dependents, whose interests for the time were identified with the interests of their mother country and were distinct from the interests of the Dutchmen along the Hudson river and of the New England settlements on Long Island. Of course, too, the Church of England was the characteristic institution of the English party, and with all diligence the royal governors and their helpers were getting up an imitation of the Irish establishment—an established church ministering to the religious wants of a small minority, but supported by taxes on the whole people. If an English party was a good thing in New York, why would not an English party be an equally good thing in Connecticut and the other New England colonies? And if the Church of England was efficient to promote the growth of the English party in New York, why would it not be equally efficient to aid the formation and progress of an English party among the New Englanders? Nothing could be more natural than such reasoning on the part of my lord Cornbury and Col. Heathcote.

The plan for an invasion of Connecticut in the name of the Church of England, was drawn out for the consideration of "the Honorable Society" in November, 1705. It was carried into effect seven or eight months afterwards. Dr. Beardsley describes the process of invasion. Mr. Muirson, of whom Col. Heathcote had made mention as the best man for the attempt, had his station at Rye, a township originally belonging to Connecticut, but wrested from it with the New England towns on Long Island in 1683. He was supported there partly by a tax levied on all the inhabitants, and partly by his stipend from

the Society for propagating the Gospel. Rye, as Dr. Beardsley says, "was a good point from which to act upon this colony."

"Some of the Connecticut people living near attended the services of Mr. Muirson, and thus he became acquainted with their feelings and inclinations. In the summer of 1706, after the drooping prospects of his own parish, by the Divine blessing had revived, he and Colonel Heathcote set out upon a journey to explore the shore towns from Greenwich to Stratford. They rode into the latter village—the Colonel 'fully armed,'—and finding a suitable place for worship, Mr. Muirson, though threatened 'with prison and hard usage,' preached to a very numerous congregation, and baptized about twenty-four, mostly grown people. Upon a repetition of the visit a few months later, their entrance was disputed, and their object opposed." p. 20.

Dr. Trumbull tells the same story in substantially the same way. He omits, indeed, the picturesque incident of Colonel Heathcote, attended by the adventurous missionary, riding into Stratford "fully armed"—an incident which reminds us of the knight Hudibras with his squire Ralpho, when "forth he rode a coloneling," or of Abijah White in McFingal, when that doughty representative of the Marshfield tories, on his way to Boston, "himself in dread array involved," and,

"In awful pomp descending down,
Bore terror on the factious town,"—

but the more important fact, that the expedition to Stratford was by no means welcome is not concealed by the venerable historian. He says, "the ministers and people, in that and the adjacent towns it seems, were alarmed at his [Mr. Muirson's] coming, and took pains to prevent their neighbors and families from hearing him. However, the novelty of the affair, and the circumstances, brought together a considerable assembly and Mr. Muirson baptized five and twenty persons, principally adults." "In April, 1707, he made another visit to Stratford. Colonel Heathcote was pleased to honor him with his company, as he had done before,"—whether in complete armor we are not informed. "He preached at this time at Fairfield as well as Stratford, and in both towns baptized a number of children and adult persons. Both magistrates and ministers opposed the introduction of Episcopacy and advised the people not to attend the preaching of the Church missionaries, *but the opposition only increased the zeal of the Church people.*" If that opposition could have been provoked into some acts of violence

legal or illegal, the political enemies of New England might have found in such violence the occasion so much desired for making the Church of England, by the authority of king and parliament, and by military force if needed, the established church in Connecticut, as it had been made already in New York. That there was no violent opposition to the intrusion, no disorderly outbreak to suppress an enterprise which Dr. Beardsley assures us was exceedingly offensive to the people generally, no attempt to enforce the laws against the intruders, may be regarded as proving that the counsels which prevailed with the magistrates and with the people were wisely moderate.

Thus it came to pass, seventy years after the beginning of the colony, that the Church of England, which had found a lodgment in Massachusetts as an inseparable attendant of a governor appointed by the crown, entered Connecticut in the person of a tory colonel, escorting, "fully armed," a missionary of the S. P. G. We learn from Dr. Beardsley, that a Church-of-England parish, with wardens and vestrymen, was organized in Stratford at the second visit of Heathcote and Muirson—a circumstance which Dr. Trumbull seems not to have known, for his information evidently confounded the organization of the parish with the building of the church edifice commenced in 1723. Another item which we learn from Dr. Beardsley, but which Trumbull had not heard of, is that the first Church-of-England missionary, stationed at Stratford, was not the Rev. George Pigot in 1722, but a Rev. Francis Phillips in 1712. Phillips was a man whose tastes and manners (and perhaps his morals also) were entirely out of place in Stratford. After about six months, having in the meanwhile spent much of his time in New York, he abandoned his flock, leaving them, says Dr. Beardsley, "in a condition worse than he found them—a scorn and reproach to their enemies."

The Episcopal Church, then, was planted in Connecticut as an exotic brought in from the neighboring province of New York. But the exotic had hardly taken root, when there began to be an indigenous Episcopalianism in Connecticut—the product of causes which had operated in the foregoing ecclesiastical history of the colony. Just then the leading influences,

among the clergy and in the commonwealth, were working to substitute a more substantial and effective ecclesiastical system in place of that Congregationalism which came over with Thomas Hooker and John Davenport. When George Keith, who had once traveled through New England as a Quaker preacher, came in his new character as an ordained priest of the English establishment, he and his associate Talbot, a naval chaplain, were graciously received at New London by the pastor, Gurdon Saltonstall, (Dr. Beardsley tells the story, pp. 18, 19), preached in his pulpit, and were assured by him of "his good affection to the Church of England." Six years afterwards, the same Gurdon Saltonstall was the governor under whose administration and influence the attempt was made to impose a new "ecclesiastical constitution" on the colony. The attempt was not highly successful, especially in the first few years, for the churches, notwithstanding the reaction toward Nationalism, retained their Congregational traditions, and were jealous for their self-government. Although the ambiguous Saybrook Platform had been accepted by the legislature and declared to be the constitution of the churches established by the colonial laws, many of the churches were protesting against it, and nobody could tell as yet what would become of it, or what would be the practical interpretation of it.*

Surely we need not wonder that while such a revolution or attempted revolution was in progress, there were some among the younger clergy of the colony who entertained a bolder plan than that which the leading men around them were so cautiously attempting. If the simple Congregationalism of the New England churches had failed, as the colonial legislature had been suggesting for more than half a century—if a new ecclesiastical constitution was requisite—especially if the compromising and uncertain scheme contrived by the Saybrook synod was in danger of breaking down at the outset—why might not a bolder attempt be more successful? Might not a bold stroke for uniformity between the ecclesiastical establishment in Connecticut and the ecclesiastical establishment in England be the right policy? Such thoughts would very nat-

* *Contributions to Eccl. Hist. of Conn.*, pp. 38-51.

ually reopen the whole question between Puritanism and the Church of England, and might produce something like a predisposition to be convinced by arguments which learned and earnest men in other times had carefully weighed and found wanting.

Timothy Cutler became pastor of the Stratford Church in 1709—just when the place was honored with occasional visits from Col. Heathcote and others from New York, and once at least by a visit from no less a personage than the governor of that royal province. One of Heathcote's letters, quoted by our author, speaks of "a very ingenious gentleman at Stratford, one Mr. Reed, the minister of that place, who is very inclinable to come over to the Church." The "ingenious gentleman" thus described was not properly "the minister of the place," for, between the death of Isaac Chauncey in 1703 and the ordination of Cutler in 1709, the Church of Stratford had no pastor. He was, doubtless, employed temporarily to preach in the vacant congregation, and if we have heard the traditions of Stratford aright, there was a division among the people in regard to him, but the party in his favor was not strong enough to place him in the pastoral office.*

Col. Heathcote, however, understood him to be the minister of that place, and negotiated with him to bring him "over to the Church." Dr. Beardsley says of him that he "expressed a willingness to receive Holy Orders, if provision in the meantime could be made for himself and his family." As Col. Heathcote put the case to the S. P. G., "If any proposal could be made to encourage his coming over for ordination, his family, which is pretty large, must be taken care of in his absence." Heathcote, as we have seen, was a shrewd manager and a zealous one. He knew what men to employ and how to influence them. Did it never occur to him, in his visits to Stratford after 1709, that the young minister of the place was also

* The story runs that Mr. Walker, who for a time was one of the ministers in Stratford, sharing with Mr. Chauncey in the use of the meeting house and the parsonage lands, preached, once, from the text, "A reed shaken with the wind." Whereupon Mr. Reed took occasion to preach from the text, "Your adversary, the devil, as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour,"—and to raise from it the doctrine that "the devil is a great walker."

an "ingenious man" who might be "inclinable to come over to the Church," and that he was better "worth the gaining" and more "capable to serve the Church," than the Mr. Reed who would have become an Episcopalian for a sufficient consideration, but did not. Did he never in that intercourse suggest to Mr. Cutler how great an achievement it would be to bring over Connecticut into conformity with the ecclesiastical establishment of Old England, and how easily the thing might be done if a few leading men would dare to undertake it? Did it never occur to the young pastor, in his occasional intercourse with distinguished and courtly visitors from New York, that the old question about prescribed forms of prayer, sacerdotal vestments, and prelatical government in the Church, might be worthy of reconsideration, and that great benefits might accrue to all parties concerned, if upon due consideration it should conclusively appear that Old England was in the right and New England in the wrong? We know not what progress Mr. Cutler's mind made while he was at Stratford, nor which way his thoughts were tending; though the information comes from a very creditable source that he said afterwards, "I was never in judgment heartily with the Dissenters, but bore it patiently until a favorable opportunity offered." *

In 1719, Cutler was chosen rector of the Collegiate School which was then just beginning to be called Yale College. Very soon after his removal to New Haven, he must have entered on those consultations (quite effectively described by Dr. Beardsley) which, at the end of three years, resulted in his going over, with Samuel Johnson of West Haven, James Wetmore of North Haven, and Daniel Brown a tutor in the Collegiate School, from the church order of New England to that of Old England. Three other pastors, Whittlesey of Wallingford, Hart of East Guilford (now Madison), and Elliot of Killingworth (now Clinton), shared in those consultations, and joined with the four first named in the manifesto which they subscribed and submitted to the trustees of the Collegiate School at commencement in 1722. Of these seven the oldest after Cutler, was Hart, forty years old, a graduate in

* Quincy's *History of Harvard College*, Vol. I., p. 365.

1703, and a pastor of fifteen years standing. The next was Elliot, thirty seven years old, a graduate in 1706, who had been a pastor thirteen years. Whittelsey was one year younger, though his graduation was in 1705, and had been a pastor ten years. The other three, Wetmore, Johnson, and Brown, were classmates, and graduated in 1714. Wetmore had been pastor four years at North Haven; Johnson after three years in the tutorship had been two years in the pastoral office at West Haven; Brown had been tutor two years; and he and the rector were just then the entire faculty of the college.

It was a serious question whether the rector and tutor of the college; with five of the few pastors (not more than forty) in the colony, could effect (if we may use an expressive word which has not yet become classical) a "stampede," and bring over the ministers and congregations of Connecticut into conformity with the Church of England. When we recollect how many political reasons Connecticut had for desiring to be on friendly terms with the ruling powers in the mother country; how much of a reaction there had been against the pure Congregationalism of Davenport and Hooker, and how imperfect and unsatisfactory as yet was the working of the new "Ecclesiastical Constitution" contrived in Saybrook in 1708; we cannot but think that the enterprise must have seemed quite hopeful. The consultations in the College library were beginning to be known abroad. Communications from the conclave at New Haven had been made to the Church of England missionary at Stratford. He had broached the matter to some of his parishioners, and had accepted Rector Cutler's invitation to be present at the next commencement. He wrote officially to his employers in England that Cutler, and the five pastors who were in the movement, had held a "conference with" him, and, said he, they "are determined to declare themselves professors of the Church of England, *as soon as they shall understand they will be supported at home.*"

The commencement to which the Stratford missionary had been invited came, and the rumors that had gone abroad, concerning a movement toward the Church of England, had pointed probably to that anniversary as a time when some developments might be looked for. Accordingly the whole

affair came out at commencement. Dr. Beardsley tells us that "the Trustees, alarmed and grieved at the intelligence which reached them, requested an interview with these gentlemen [the seven above mentioned] in the library, and there, the day after the commencement, they were all asked, from the youngest to the eldest, to state their views on the matters which troubled their consciences." The conference must have been entirely voluntary and fraternal, for of the seven who were invited to make a statement of their views, only two, the rector and the tutor, were in any sense responsible to the corporation. * It seems to us that, all things considered, the affair was managed with more than ordinary wisdom and moderation. The paper which, after free conversation, was drawn up and subscribed by the rector and his six friends, at the request of the trustees, was courteous in form and modest in expression. Addressing the communication "to the Rev. Mr. Andrew, and Mr. Woodbridge, and others, our Reverend Fathers and Brethren," they said, "Some of us doubt the validity, and the rest are more fully persuaded of the invalidity of the Presbyterian ordination, in opposition to the Episcopal, and we should be heartily thankful to God and man, if we may receive from them satisfaction herein, and shall be willing to embrace your good counsels and instructions in relation to this important affair, as far as God shall direct and dispose us to it." Dr. Beardsley informs us, doubtless on good authority, that "at the same time, two other 'pastors of great note gave their assent' to the declaration without signing it, of whom the one, Mr. Bulkley, of Colchester, declared Episcopacy to be *jure divino*, and the other, Mr. Whiting, of some remote town, also gave in his opinion for moderate Episcopacy." † These two

* The rector was not at that time, as the President now is, the head of the corporation, nor even a member, but only a person employed by the board to teach and govern the students.

† John Bulkley, of Colchester, was eminent among the Connecticut clergy of his day. He was a Harvard graduate of 1699—ordained at Colchester, 1703. His father, Gershom Bulkley, first of New London and afterwards of Wethersfield, was a man of versatile talents, early influential in the reaction against Congregationalism, and at last, after relinquishing his ministry, an enemy of the chartered government, and a justice of the peace under Sir Edmund Andros. The son was a better man than the father; but the toryism in which he was educated

names, added to the seven, indicate the extent of the movement.

We are indebted to Dr. Beardsley for what seems to be a corrected version of the story, told by Trumbull and others, that a public disputation was held at commencement, *more academico*, Governor Saltonstall being the champion on one side and Rector Cutler on the other. According to the authorities on which he relies, there was no such disputation at commencement, but, after the conference with the rector and his friends, the trustees adjourned without taking action on the case of the rector, or even accepting the offered resignation of the tutor. A month afterwards, there was to be a session of the Colonial Legislature at New Haven, and in the meantime there would be opportunity for a more thorough understanding of the case. The formal disputation, of which Trumbull knew nothing but by tradition, took place on the second day of that session. "Saltonstall, the Governor of the colony," says Dr. Beardsley, "invited and presided over a debate held the day after the session commenced, and in which he appears himself to have borne a conspicuous part." p. 30. On a subsequent page, our author speaks of "that earnest and sincere debate," "over which Governor Saltonstall presided with such candor and politeness." p. 39. He thinks, indeed, that it resulted "virtually in the discomfiture of the Trustees of the college." He says, "the advocates of the Church" had "weighed and examined the points in controversy with the utmost care, while to Saltonstall and his supporters many of them were new and perplexing. The defense of Episcopacy by one of the number, exciting some irritating remarks on the other side, the Governor abruptly put an end to the debate, and it was never reopened in the same way." He thinks that what "saved to Congregationalism three of the signers of the declaration, Elliot, Hart, and Whittelsey," was not at all the strength of the arguments employed, but only "the abrupt termination of the debate." To him, looking from his position, it seems no doubt

would naturally predispose him to the opinion that the Episcopal form of church government is *jure divino*. Samuel Whiting, of Windham, had been pastor there twenty-two years.

a very reasonable inference that Rector Outler was victorious in the disputation. But to us, the opposite inference from the facts seems irresistible. At the end of the discussion, where did the Rector find himself? Of the seven pastors who at commencement had committed themselves for his declaration, five had forsaken him. Of the five who had joined him in subscribing the declaration, only two remained with him; and they, the two youngest, were not the most able or influential. The total result was the secession of the college rector, the college tutor, and two neighboring pastors. Cutler and Johnson doubtless thought that they had the best of the argument, and that their adversaries ought to have been convinced and persuaded; but the facts show that such was not the general current of opinion.

We do not wonder at our author's sympathy with those men in what he supposes to have been the mental conflict through which they attained the conclusion that they ought not to continue "out of the visible communion of an Episcopal Church." Our impressions, we must acknowledge, are on some points a little different from his. We get the impression, even from his narrative, that they had a liking for the Church of England, and a powerful bias towards it, before they began to study the arguments used by the defenders of Queen Elizabeth's establishment against the Puritans and the Dissenters. We get the impression from his narrative, that they did not commit themselves without pretty good reason to expect something like indemnity, so far as their chances of living were concerned. They had heard of a great and powerful "Society" for propagating and establishing the Church of England in the colonies. They had seen what the Society was doing in New York, and what it had begun to do in Stratford, and they could not reasonably doubt that the same Society would take them up, and provide for them employment and remuneration, if they should lose their places by going over to the Church of England. We find, in the work before us, much to confirm the impression that they began and prosecuted their new study of the old controversy, with a cheerful hope of not only finding their own way into the English establishment, but also of carrying with them or drawing after them many ministers and

whole churches, and even of bringing the ecclesiastical constitution of the colony, ultimately, into conformity with the ecclesiastical constitution of England. Doubtless they had some misgivings, as they looked forward. They must have felt that success in such a movement, however hopeful, was by no means certain. They must have known that the course they were taking would probably be a grief to many of their friends; that controversy was likely to ensue; that they would be regarded as governed by unworthy motives; and that unreasonable and cruel reproaches might be heaped upon them. But we cannot think that they were, on the whole, under any temptation to resist the arguments for prescribed forms of worship and a prelatical government over the churches, or to violate their consciences when they found their convictions leading them in that direction. Perhaps Thomas Hooker, John Cotton, and John Davenport were wrong-headed; but surely the sacrifices which they knew they must make, when they found themselves constrained to refuse conformity to certain arbitrary and in their view superstitious regulations of the ecclesiastical establishment in England, were to the sacrifices which Cutler and his associates knew they must make by going over to Anglicanism, as mountains are to mole-hills. For our part, we are unable to see how the sacrifices which those men made, or could have expected to make, a hundred and forty-four years ago, were greater on the whole than the sacrifices which a Congregational minister or candidate for the ministry is now required to make, when he conquers his prejudices, gets new light on the question of apostolical succession, and applies to the nearest bishop for orders. Assuming that such a minister or candidate has as much earnestness as we freely recognize in Cutler and Johnson, we cannot but see that the change in his ecclesiastical relations must bring with it some not very pleasant experiences. His friends—perhaps his nearest relatives—will be grieved by his defection, and some of them may be permanently alienated. Some people may ascribe to him various unworthy motives, and may say unkind and bitter things against him. He cuts himself off from the privilege of preaching in Congregational churches, and from the chance of obtaining a settlement in some Congregational parish. But he

hopes to find new friends and to form new intimacies, and he is quite sure that in the new ecclesiastical relations to which he finds himself attracted, his ministry will be as highly appreciated, and his chances of finding remunerative employment will be as good as in his present connection. We cannot recollect an instance within our own observation—nor have we read or heard of an instance from the days of Vesey * to the present time—in which a Congregational minister or candidate for the ministry can be considered as having made any sacrifice in respect to position or livelihood, by becoming an Episcopalian.

Our feeling for Outler and his three associates has most of sympathy in it, not when they were in the college library consulting and reading up for their contemplated movement, nor even at the college commencement, when they took their position and subscribed their declaration ; for, up to that time, though they doubtless felt they were contemplating a very serious movement, and one which might separate them from many of their friends, and in which they might (especially if unsuccessful) bring upon themselves some degree of local unpopularity, their hopes must have been far greater than their fears. We begin to feel for them when, after the four anxious weeks that passed between the college commencement and the October session of the Legislature at New Haven, while the public opinion of the colony had been forming itself, they found that their great movement was a failure ; that of the eight pastors on whom they had relied, not without good reason, only two were left ; that the political leaders of the colony, “ notwithstanding their yearning after “ a permanent establishment ” and “ a good and regular issue in cases subject to ecclesiastical discipline,” would not go with them ; and that the people, with their inherited prejudices, were overwhelmingly against them. We are sorry for them when they found that Gov. Saltonstall, who, nineteen years before, had entertained the Propagation Society’s two emissaries as hospitably as if they were angels

* In the year 1697, Rev. William Vesey, who had been “ a dissenting preacher on Long Island,” was induced by Governor Fletcher to change his ecclesiastical relations, and became consequently the first rector of Trinity Church, in New York. See Documentary History of New York, Vol. III, p. 488.

in disguise, and had expressed to them "his good affection to the Church of England," was firm against the revolution which they had hoped for, and, with all his dignity and urbanity, was ready to enter the lists of public disputation against them. We are sorry for them when, on the day after that public disputation, the Trustees of the Collegiate School discharged the rector without any resignation or request on his part, as quietly and with as little formality as if he had been only the college carpenter. We are sorry for them, when Johnson, beloved as he had been by his parishioners in West Haven, offered to remain with them if they would receive him as a minister of the Church of England, and only half a dozen of them were willing to accept the offer. We are the more sorry for them, because we respect their character and motives. They thought they were attempting what would be greatly for the advantage of Connecticut, and for the advancement of the Church of God; and, therefore, we have a sympathy with them in their disappointment.

The four seceders from the ecclesiastical constitution of the colony found their way across the Atlantic, and were received at Canterbury and elsewhere with the honors which they had a right to expect. Dr. Beardsley's pages glow with exultant feeling as he describes their welcome to old England, their joy in the pomp and beauty of cathedral worship, and the expressions of sympathy and honor with which they were greeted by dignitaries in the church and by nobles in the realm. Cutler, Johnson, and Brown, who went over together in the autumn of 1722, were doubly ordained—deacons and priests—in March, 1723, by the Bishop of Norwich, the then Bishop of London (whose diocese was supposed to include all the colonies) being disabled by a fatal illness. Almost immediately after their ordination, Brown sickened and died of small pox—a disease against which there was in those days no protection, and from which Cutler had hardly recovered. The two survivors visited Oxford and Cambridge, and from each of the universities Cutler received the degree of Doctor in Divinity, and Johnson that of Master of Arts. To the new Bishop of London, to leading members of the Propagation Society, at the universities, and to clergymen and laymen wherever they had oppor-

tunity, they represented not only the hopefulness of the colonies as a field for making converts to the Church, but also the indispensableness of a bishop to the most successful prosecution of that work. Had their arguments prevailed with the powers that were at Westminster, Cutler was most evidently the man upon whose brow the mitre should have been placed. But their request—a request which no man could deny without exposing his entire want of belief in the doctrine of episcopal church government and apostolical succession—was not granted. The fault seems not to have been with the bishops, but entirely with the government. With the king's ministers it was a question not of religious duty, nor of religious liberty, nor of the welfare of souls, nor of the advancement of the only true Church, but only a question of colonial policy. A church-of-England party in the colonies was a good thing for the British interest, but would a bishop there, or an order of bishops, be a good thing for the British interest? Of course the colonial Episcopalians, and those in England who regarded the question from a religious or ecclesiastical point of view, thought that a bishop for the colonies would be a good thing—good not only for the interest of the true Church, but also for the interest of the British government and of British trade. But the government, representing the Head of the Church—the king's ministers, without whose consent and appointment the bishops were powerless—seem to have thought otherwise. So Cutler and Johnson, with Wetmore who had joined them in England, were sent back as missionaries to do what they could under the conditions of the case. They were to preach the duty of being confirmed by a bishop to people who had never seen a bishop, and were not likely ever to see one, and in a country in which such confirmation was an impossibility. They were to make the Christian people of New England believe that nobody on this continent could be authorized to perform the Christian rite of baptism, or to break bread in remembrance of Christ, without first performing six thousand miles of sea navigation, as they had done, and obtaining "orders" from the bishop of London. They were to make the Christian people in these colonies believe that the functions of a bishop were essential to their spiritual welfare, while the government at

Westminster was giving an impressive contradiction to all such doctrine, by refusing to permit the consecration of a bishop for the colonies.

How much impression had been made upon Connecticut by the defection of Rector Cutler, Tutor Brown, and Pastors Johnson and Wetmore, may be inferred from the fact that the managers of the S. P. G. do not seem to have regarded the time as calling for any great expansion of their work in that colony. Cutler was well provided for, by being placed at Boston in charge of a Church-of-England parish just instituted there. Everybody could see that he had lost nothing by "changing his religious connections." Wetmore was stationed at Rye, and there, as a clergyman of the Established Church in the royal province of New York, being supported partly by an assessment, from which the Dissenters were not excepted, and partly by a stipend from the Propagation Society, he had little occasion, through his long life, to regret the loss of his parish and salary in North Haven. Johnson alone of the three was sent to Connecticut; nor was he sent to establish a new mission. His appointment was to Stratford, in the place of Mr. Pigot, who was removed to Providence. The place was less to be desired than that which Cutler had gained at Boston; but, in every worldly view, it was more desirable than that of Congregational pastor at West Haven. Every Congregational minister or candidate for the ministry in the colony, whose mind was afflicted with any doubt concerning the validity of Presbyterian ordination, or in any way open to conviction in favor of diocesan episcopacy, could see that neither of those three ministers had suffered any loss of livelihood or social position by going over to the Church of England.

Results demonstrated that the Propagation Society acted wisely in appointing Mr. Johnson to its mission in Connecticut. He seems to have been heartily conscientious in his preference of the ecclesiastical system established in England to that which had been established in the colony. We entertain no doubt that he was a good man, and, according to his light, a faithful minister of the Gospel. He was diligent, earnest, and persevering in his work of "gaining over the people" to the Episcopal separation from the established order.

Nor was he unsuccessful. He is the hero of the story in this volume. The history of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, from the day of his return to the day of his death, is chiefly, we may say, the history of his labors and achievements. In everything but the power of communicating grace by the laying on of apostolic hands, he was the first bishop of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut—quite as much a bishop as any who have since borne the title which, for the political reasons which controlled the government at Westminster, he was not allowed to bear—reasons which he (in his grief at the death of a beloved son, who had gone to England for ordination, and perished there of small pox) denounced as “the atheistical politics of this miserable, abandoned age.” In some respects, the times were favorable to his work. At first, the formalism and “parish way” into which the primitive zeal of the New England fathers had so widely degenerated, was an advantage to him. The soil, as we have already said, had been prepared for the seed which he was sowing. Afterwards, the great awakening, with its reaction against formalism, and with the extravagances and fanaticisms which attended it, gave him a new advantage. Many who could not unite with the Congregational pastors generally in acknowledging the revival of religion, and praising God for it, were easily persuaded to become Episcopalians; just as, on the other hand, many who could not join in the endeavor to repress extravagancies, to drive away enthusiastic errors, and to have all things done decently and in order, were disgusted by what seemed to them the coldness and unbelief of the standing ministry, and became first Separates and then Baptists. The colonial laws for the support of the ministry by parochial taxation were such, and were often so administered, as to give great advantage to the propagation of a rival system, armed with the *prestige* and pretensions of the English establishment, and sustained by English funds. The “Honorable Society’s” missionaries loved to send home reports of how much the adherents of the Church of England in Connecticut suffered from legal exactions for the building of meeting houses, and the support of “dissenting” ministers. Dr. Beardsley repeats their complaints, and dwells upon them, as if those missionaries were the conscious forerunners and the

self-sacrificing preachers of what we call religious liberty. To him at this day, and to us, the entire theory of our religious liberty is self-evident. He agrees with us in holding that to provide religious instruction, and to compel the support of any form of worship, is not among the functions of civil government. But it is important to the truth of history that we take care not to impute our theory of religious liberty—the Roger Williams theory—the Baptist theory—to the pre-revolutionary Episcopalians in Connecticut. In their view, as in that of the “Honorable Society” which sustained them, the evil complained of was not that men were by law required to pay for the support of religion, or for the support of religious institutions at variance with their preferences; it was that instead of “Dissenters” being taxed, as in “the more liberal province of New York,” for the benefit of the Church of England, adherents of the Church of England in Connecticut were liable to be taxed, by a majority vote in a parish meeting, for the building of a Congregational meeting-house or the support of a Congregational pastor. This reversing of a most natural and reasonable arrangement—this outrage on the evident and immutable fitness of things—was a grievance ever crying to the king for redress. Doubtless all the Episcopalians in Connecticut to-day, from the bishop to the humblest sexton, are unanimous in holding that the ancient English institution of church-rates (not yet abolished in this year of grace, 1866) is grossly indefensible; but we are bold to say that so long as the Episcopal Church in Connecticut was the Church of England in an English colony, and was supported by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, no such thought found entertainment in the bosoms of loyal “churchmen.” If Dr. Beardsley shall have occasion—as we hope he may—to revise his work for an English edition, we trust he will not permit his readers to suppose that any missionary of the S. P. G. ever denied, directly or indirectly, in word or thought, the reasonableness of compelling dissenters to share equally with others in parochial assessments for the benefit of the Church of England.

Our author makes it plain that the result of the Propagation Society's missions, in Connecticut, so far as they were successful, was precisely what their aim was. The Church of Eng-

land being a political institution, and its introduction into the colonies being desired for political ends, its missionaries could not but be in some sort political missionaries, laboring to promote and perpetuate the dependence of the colony on Great Britain. Not only because they were personally dependent on English contributions, but also because their training, their position, their relations, and their *esprit du corps* brought them into sympathy with the servile and tory party in the English establishment, they and their followers could not but hold the British view concerning the powers of the government at Westminster over the Anglo-American people. As the questions between the colonies in America and the imperial island began to be shaped into a definite issue, and the purpose to bring a free and brave people inhabiting this continent into absolute dependence on the British Parliament began to be developed in the form of stamp-duties, tea-duties, standing armies quartered on the inhabitants, Boston port bill, and the like, it became evident that all the labors of the Propagation Society had been in fact subservient to the designs of the British government against the political liberty of the colony. Dr. Beardsley sets this fact in the sunlight. His Chapter XVIII., describing the alarms and agitations caused by the Stamp Act, is most explicit. He tells us, that in September, 1765, seven of the missionaries, being accidentally convened, "sent an address to the Venerable Society, to the effect that 'although the commotions and disaffection in this country were very great, relative to what was called the imposition of the Stamp Act,' yet they had the satisfaction of stating that the people of the Church of England in general in this colony, as they were able to assure the Society, and those particularly under their own respective charges, were of a contrary temper and conduct, esteeming it *nothing short of rebellion* to speak evil of dignities, and *to avow opposition to this last act of Parliament.*'" He quotes another missionary, Dr. Leaming, of Norwalk, who said, in a letter of about the same date, "I have the satisfaction to assure the Society that missionaries being placed in this colony is not only very serviceable in a religious but in a civil sense. In the northeast part of this colony, there have been most rebellious outrages

committed, on account of the Stamp Act, while those towns where the Church has got footing have calmly submitted to the civil authority"—that is, to the British Parliament usurping the right to tax Americans. He quotes another, Mr. Beach, of Newtown, who wrote only a day or two later: "I have of late taken pains to warn my people against having any concern in the seditious tumults with relation to the Stamp-duty enjoined upon us by the Legislature at home; and I can with truth and pleasure say, that I cannot discover the least inclination toward rebellious conduct in any of the church people here, who remember with the sincerest gratitude the favors we have received from the mother country; and we esteem ourselves under the strongest obligations of *all dutiful obedience to the government at home.*"

It should be said that some at least of the Episcopal clergy at that crisis were sagacious enough to see what the result would be of measures like the Stamp Act, and bold enough to let their friends in England know the danger. Yet we do not see that they denied at all the right of the British nation represented in Parliament to tax the American people. Our author gives large extracts from what Dr. Chandler, of Elizabethtown, New Jersey, wrote to the Society in January, 1766. Chandler's heart, like Johnson's, was set on obtaining bishops for the colonies; and he seems to have seen, as Johnson saw, that the attempt to rob the colonies of their political liberty was making Episcopacy and the Church of England odious. He said to the Society, "It seems to be the determined, inflexible resolution of most people, from Halifax to Georgia, at all hazards, even of death and destruction, never to submit to what they esteem so great an infringement of their essential rights, as some of the late acts of the British Parliament." He argued strongly against the policy of such legislation. "Most probably," said he, "the Parliament is able (although most people here pretend not to believe that they are) to enforce the Stamp Act; yet should they resolve to do it," the consequences would surely be disastrous. Yet he thought that "if the interests of the Church of England in America had been made a national concern, according to the policy of all other nations that have had colonies"—that is, if the Church of England had

been betimes established in the colonies by the power of the British government, and bishops had been sent over—"by this time a general *submission to the parent-country* in every thing not sinful, after no other efforts than dutiful remonstrances, might have been expected not only for wrath but for conscience sake." "Submission to the parent country" was conceded to be the duty of Americans—submission "in every thing not sinful," for not even the toryism of those days was servile enough to deny the paramount obligation of a "higher law," higher even than an act of Parliament. "Submission to the parent country in everything not sinful" was the creed of the Church of England in the colonies; and if that Church had been duly cared for by the government of the parent country, supplied with bishops, and endowed at the public expense, there would have been no opposition to the Stamp Act save by "dutiful remonstrance." Our author himself, true as he is in his loyalty to his country, shows unconsciously, in one passage, that the old Church-of-England feeling in regard to the conflict between the colonies and Great Britain has descended to him, with other traditions. Speaking of the Church of England here in the time of the agitation caused by the Stamp Act, he says: "She was loyal then, as now, to the *rightly constituted government*." This is quite of a piece with the passage in his preface, where, in reference to the so-called Loyalists, "who steadily adhered to the cause of the Crown during the war of the Revolution," he says: "The events of the last four years in our country must teach us to entertain a higher respect for the men who did not at once join in the cause for independence, violate their oaths of allegiance, and disown submission to the long established government." Does he hold after all that the power of the British Parliament to impose taxes at discretion on the people of America was part of "the long established government" over the colonies? Does he mean that if we honor those citizens in the Southern States who have maintained their allegiance to the United States, as their country, through the five years of the rebellion, we must render the same sort of honor to the tories of Connecticut in the time of the revolutionary conflict? We trust not. He calls Benedict Arnold a "traitor to his country." If the

Church-of England view of the conflict was right, Benedict Arnold simply went over from the side of rebellion against "the Lord's anointed" to the side of "the rightly constituted government." He found himself on the wrong side—he found that he had "violated his oath of allegiance and disowned submission to the long established government"—and he went back, and did what he could to repair the wrong. Being an officer in the Continental Army, he went over to the King of Great Britain, then a belligerent enemy of the United States, and took a commission in his service. Was he less excusable than those men who, in 1861, having been educated at the expense of the United States, and bearing commissions as officers in the army or navy, went over to the enemies of the United States, and took up arms against a government and a country that had done far more for them than ever England and the British Government had done for the missionaries of the Propagation Society?

We would not cast a stone upon the grave of any of those missionaries. We would think charitably of the congregations that adhered to them while they adhered to the cause of the British Parliament. The religion of those persons, priests and people, was an English religion. It was the religion of the King, of the Archbishop of Canterbury, of the two Houses of Parliament, of the nobility and gentry, of the universities, and of the army and navy. The idea that the parent country was to govern the colonies by acts of Parliament, and that the colonies existed for the parent country, was intertwined with their religious ideas and sympathies, and was as well settled in their minds as any one of the Thirty-nine Articles. In the same way, thousands of otherwise intelligent and well meaning people throughout the Southern States, six years ago, verily believed the dogma of paramount state sovereignty, and were carried by it into rebellion. After the revolutionary war, when it had been forever settled that the people of America were not to be governed by the British Parliament in the interest of the parent country, the Episcopalians of Connecticut, clergy and laity—as many as did not go to Nova Scotia—being no longer members of the Church of England, became gradually but heartily loyal to their country as they had been to

their king. So in time, now that the dogma of paramount state sovereignty has been disposed of, and slavery annihilated, a new feeling of loyalty to the nation will be slowly but surely kindled in bosoms that have never yet been conscious of it. Meanwhile let patience have her perfect work. We must wait. Let the abolition of slavery and the full establishment of our national unity bring (and surely it will bring) such prosperity to the new South as liberty and independence brought to the American people; and the growth of loyalty will be sure.

When the Church of England in the persons of Colonel Heathcote and Missionary Muirson invaded the Puritan colony of Connecticut, and thenceforward till the recognition of our national independence, there was much of jealous and indignant feeling on the part of the Congregational ministry and of the people generally. The feeling was partly a tradition from the times when New England was settled by people whom the established Church of their native country would not tolerate, and whose struggles against an imposed and burthen-some ritualism had made them intolerant of the entire system of church government with which that ritualism was identified and by which it was enforced. Partly, too, the feeling came from the sensitiveness of a people watchful for the religious liberty and the political self-government which had been obtained at a great cost, and which they could hardly hope to preserve without perpetual and jealous vigilance. But it may be doubted whether the querulous reports of the missionaries to their patrons in England—however honestly intended—give a perfectly fair and full account of the treatment which they and their adherents received, or of the relations between them and the Congregational ministry and people. There are some significant facts which come to the surface incidentally as we glide along the stream of Dr. Beardsley's flowing narrative. Whatever local feuds, or personal altercations, or public controversies arose in connection with the progress of the Church of England in one place and another, it is evident that Dr. Johnson's * policy of "meeting the prejudices of the Independents in a spirit of kindness and conciliation" was not without its effect upon the

* The degree of Doctor of Divinity was conferred upon the father of the Episcopal Church in Connecticut, by the University of Oxford, in 1748.

relations between the two bodies of clergy in Connecticut. Our author tells us that "from the first, the missionaries and the Congregational ministers often maintained a familiar intercourse with each other in private life, and showed on various occasions a mutual respect." p. 119. He gives, in his appendix, a letter, heretofore unpublished, from Dr. Johnson to President Clap of Yale College, protesting against a certain regulation then recently enacted by the Corporation.* Earnestly as that letter argued against the regulation referred to, it shows that the relations between the two men were far from personal unfriendliness; for at the close the writer says, "I conclude with earnestly begging that neither your insisting on this law, nor anything else, may occur to destroy or interrupt our harmony and friendship." Dr. Johnson's two sons had both been educated at Yale; and it was his boast that Dean Berkeley's donations to the college had been made at his persuasion. The Episcopal clergy, as well as the Congregational, convened at the annual Commencement in New Haven and "consulted the best things they could" for the interests of the Church." p. 159. Membership in the Church of England made no man odious in Connecticut. The illustrious son of Dr. Johnson was loved and trusted by the people before the revolution, because they had reason to believe that he loved his

* The students were by that regulation forbidden to attend any other public worship than that which had just been established in the College hall preparatory to the building of a College Chapel. An exception was made in favor of students who had been educated in the worship of the Church of England and were of that communion; they were allowed to be absent at those times when the Sacrament was administered in that Church, at Christmas, and all other times when their absence would not be an infraction of the general and standing rules of the College. The object of the regulation was to keep the students from attending either of the two Congregational churches in New Haven, and to bring them entirely under the religious influence of the college itself, more orthodox than the First Church was then supposed to be under the ministry of Mr. Noyes, and more conservative and safe than the Separate (now the North) Church. Although the exception in favor of Episcopalians was as large as the President and Fellows then knew how to make without giving up their main object, it was not large enough for the views of Dr. Johnson. It should be remembered that then and ever since, till a very recent date, no Dissenter from the Church of England could even be matriculated in the English Universities. Only a few years ago any Oxford student was liable to a severe penalty for the offense of attending at any place of worship not according to the established church.

country. He was one of the commissioners from Connecticut in the first Continental Congress,—that of 1765—and the address to the king from that Congress remonstrating against the Stamp-act, and against all similar attempts of the British people to tax America, was chiefly written by him. The next year he was sent to England as a special agent from the Colony to argue for it an important cause that was to be heard “before the Lords in Council;” and for five years he remained there entrusted with various public as well as private affairs. He returned in 1771, just before his venerable father’s death, and was received with every demonstration of affectionate joy by his fellow-citizens of Stratford and all the region round about. Such was his influence with the Episcopalians of his native town, that “as early as 1774, not a man in Stratford was ready to dissent from revolutionary measures and from the movements, in various places, expressive of sympathy for those who suffered from the oppressive acts of the British government.” (p. 310.) He “guided the course of Churchmen there to a quiet and inoffensive neutrality.” So heartily did Connecticut trust in that Episcopalian son of the father of Connecticut Episcopalianism, that he was “one of the three first chosen to represent the colony” in the immortal Congress of the revolution; but from that service he was excused on account of another public engagement. When the war began with the fight of Lexington, he, as a member of the Council or Upper House of the colonial legislature, with an associate from the House of Representatives, was deputed to visit the British commander at Boston in the hope of devising some means by which the bloody conflict might even then be avoided. We need not say that the attempt was unsuccessful. He seems to have felt—as almost every man in Connecticut, who had ever visited the mother country, felt—that it was madness to resist the power of Great Britain, and that what could not be gained by remonstrance and negotiation must be lost. After the Declaration of Independence, he resigned his seat in the Council, and took no part in the conflict. Yet—and the fact is surely not less honorable to the people of Puritan Connecticut than to him—his fellow-citizens lost no portion of their confidence in him. They knew that he loved his country, and they respected his scruples.

When the war was over, he was recalled to public life. He was the first of the three delegates from Connecticut in the Convention which framed the Constitution of the United States, the others being Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth. He was one of the Senators first appointed by the Legislature of Connecticut under the National Constitution. His portrait, in the scarlet robe of an Oxford Doctor of the Civil Law, is among the memorial pictures that adorn the Hall of the Alumni of his own *alma mater*. The name of WILLIAM SAMUEL JOHNSON, with the record of the services which he lovingly rendered to Connecticut, and of the well-earned honors which Connecticut, grateful and proud, conferred upon him, is proof enough that the old Puritan Connecticut, before, and through, and after the Revolution, was not so narrow in its Puritanism as to ostracise a true and patriotic man for being an Episcopalian. As a sequel to that record, and as illustrating the hereditary sentiment in the Johnson family toward the old politics of Connecticut, it may be added that when certain political managers, in 1816, were making a combination of sectarian influences to effect the overthrow of the old "Federalist" party in Connecticut, and especially of what had been "the standing order," they approached the late Judge Johnson, of Stratford, (son of the revolutionary statesman, and grandson of the Church-of-England missionary, and himself a graduate of Yale) with the proposal to make him Governor of the State if he would give his influence to the scheme, and that the proposal was promptly rejected.

ARTICLE VI.—MRS. SIGOURNEY.

Letters of Life. By MRS. L. H. SIGOURNEY. With an additional chapter by her daughter. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 414.

WHENEVER any person has died in our country, during the last score of years, who was of public reputation sufficiently wide-spread to justify it, or of interest to his own family circle enough to make them wish such a thing, a kind of calm and peaceful confidence has rested in our minds, that, within a brief season, a poetical obituary would appear in the public prints from the well-known pen of Mrs. Sigourney. Indeed, so general has been this confidence among the people of Connecticut, that some persons, who, from peculiar modesty or from some other reason, have desired to escape the notice of the great world after death, have been beset by a kind of perpetual fear that she might survive them, and thus, having them at a great disadvantage, might send out their names into all the earth. And then, on the other hand, multitudes of longing hearts have poured forth before her their earnest petitions, that she would give their deceased friends the benefit of her Muse; and some have even requested, while in the fullness of life and vigor, that she would kindly remember themselves when they should have passed away. No one, however obscure or however youthful, has had a doubt, that even himself might, in some future day, be turned into song, or his own humble virtues made the poet's theme. But amid all this confidence for others, has not the thought, perchance, sometimes risen—what will be done when Mrs. Sigourney herself dies; who shall sing her praise in an obituary sonnet; and has not a painful doubt mingled itself with our peaceful confidence, showing that this world was not intended to be a place of perfect repose of mind? These trying questions are now answered, for, with a fitness that must impress every soul, Mrs. Sigourney appears before us once more, for the last time, and tells the story of

herself. And this story is not a sonnet, but a book; as it should be, indeed, for the life that had already opened itself in a whole volume of obituaries might properly show, at its close, that it was itself one obituary volume.

"Letters of Life" is the title which has been selected, doubtless because the narrative is given as if in a series of letters to one of her cherished friends. Whether they were actually sent to this friend, is a point which we are unable to determine from reading them; but, however this may have been, they bear the most evident marks of an intention, on the part of the distinguished writer, that they should meet the public eye. In sending them everywhere throughout the land, in a printed form, the dutiful daughter has undoubtedly followed the wish, if not the command, of the departed mother. We feel, therefore, that Mrs. Sigourney herself has desired that her life might continue in this world, and that we may, accordingly, speak of her with something of the freedom which is at times denied us in reference to the dead. With kindness and with full measure of praise we wish to speak, for we believe she lived a useful life, which was worthy of commendation for many things. But we must approach her book with all freedom of criticism, and we must be allowed the privilege of a hearty laugh, for the former is our duty in our present work, while the latter is a necessity laid upon us, both by her nature and our own.

The authoress begins her first letter by saying, that her life has been "little varied by incident," and the pleasant narrative which we read on the following pages shows most clearly the truth of this remark. Man's life, in general, has been said by some one to consist of three great things—being born, getting married, and dying. If ever a life drew near to this simplicity, we may almost say that Mrs. Sigourney's was that life; and the really interesting volume, which she has made as it were out of nothing, seems to justify the undoubting trust in her powers, which was manifested by so many strangers in sending to her for poems for every occasion and on every subject. We smile, as she tells us of the letter which she once received, requesting an elegy on a young man, "who was one of the nine children of a judge of probate, and quite the Benjamin of the

family, the member of a musical society, and who, had he lived, would likely have been married in about a year," but of whose character and life she knew nothing beyond these interesting facts. Yet as we finish this account of her own life, we hardly wonder that these few things were deemed sufficient to excite her poetic fervor, and we have a prevailing belief that the wished-for elegy can now be found somewhere among her published or unpublished works. She was born in Norwich, Connecticut; lived there with her parents, in the mansion of an aged and respected lady, and afterwards in a house which had been purchased and repaired by her own father; removed, when she was about twenty-three years of age, to Hartford, where she established and for several years conducted a young ladies' school; married, in 1819, Mr. Charles Sigourney; lived in two different houses with him during his life-time, and in one without him after his death; and died, at the age of seventy-four, "loving all and beloved by all," on the 13th of June, 1865. This is the sum and substance of the book. Indeed, so little of incident is there in her whole career, that the first journey which she made from Norwich to Hartford—a ride of perhaps eight hours—is the subject of a lengthy description, and takes rank in the volume almost as one of the marked events of her history. We thank her for the prominence which she gives to this journey, for it carries us back in memory to the days when we were ourselves so familiar with the old stage, and with its sluggish movement through the sleepy villages that lie between these leading towns of our ancient Commonwealth. How we groaned in prospect of that dull ride for days beforehand; how our boyish heart felt that the jolting vehicle, on its leather springs, was the messenger coming to bear us away from the home we loved, and the dear old maiden aunt whom we loved better even than the home; how we yielded at last, when the destined hour arrived, to the resistless fate that laid hold upon us, and knowing that we should be sick and sorrowful all the way, took our place under the driver's care; how, as we traveled on over the dusty road, Franklin seemed ten miles away from home, and Lebanon twenty miles from Franklin, and Columbia still farther from Lebanon, and the day the longest day, except an occasional Sunday, that the world ever knew;

how we thought Bolton hill must have turned itself completely round since we had crossed it on our last journey, so that we could never go down the hill, but must always go up, and with a slow progress, which grew ever slower; and finally how the elms of East Hartford and the spires of the city itself filled us with rejoicing, and the feeling came that nothing in this transitory world could ever induce us to enter that hateful stage again—except, indeed, another sight of the old ancestral home in Norwich. It all comes back to us once more, to-day, but, in the distance of years, there is something of a sort of dreaminess about it, which makes it appear more pleasing now than it once did; and even the driver and his horses move more gracefully and rapidly in the picture, than they used to do in the reality. As we follow our authoress from page to page, we feel that a similar dreamy and, in her case, poetic haze must have gathered about her mind, as she reviewed all the past history, so that everything assumed to itself an unreal beauty before her retrospective vision. Let us accompany her in her course through life, and open to our readers somewhat of her descriptions and her thoughts. In doing this, we propose in the first place to speak, at some length, of her style, and then to consider, as impartially and with as just appreciation of her as possible, her character and her life's work.

It has been always, among the circle of our acquaintance, here and elsewhere, a point of much discussion, whether Mrs. Sigourney could fairly claim the name of poet. Some have earnestly maintained her right to this honor, and have compared her with Mrs. Hemans favorably. Others have, as stoutly, denied it,—have thought she was only like the organ-grinder, as compared with a true musician,—and we have heard of one person, who even went so far as to be unwilling to go from New Haven to Hartford on the same train of cars with her, lest, if any accident befel him, she might rhyme about his unlucky fate. As for ourselves, we have hitherto ventured upon no opinion, and this from a felt want of competence to form one. We have no poetic talent. We had one or two distinguished ancestors, indeed, widely honored for their powers and services in many lines, who wrote poetical

works, but since no one of them ever attained higher praise than that of being "almost a poet—not quite," we have sorrowfully searched in vain through our inheritance from them for any portion of this happy gift. There was once, also, a prominent relative of ours by marriage, who became the author of a collection of poems of a moral and religious character, and then gave them to the world in a volume, but inheritance ordinarily comes through blood alone, we believe, and we have never been able to discover in ourselves anything like his poetry. With a hopelessly prosaic soul, therefore, we have left the disputation to others, and it has gone on, without end, till the present moment. But, as we take up these *Letters of Life*, and read the description of her early home in Norwich, we are sure that Mrs. Sigourney must have had a poetic imagination. It so happens, as we have already intimated, that, in former years, we were quite familiar with that beautiful town, and there are around us a considerable number of persons who know the old house, and the history of the family that lived there, better than we do. And we all agree that the story displays imagination.

The house, where she was born, she says, "was among the better class of New England houses at that day,—spacious but not lofty, a broad hall intersecting it in the middle, with suits of rooms on each side. Its court-yard was of the richest velvet turf; two spruce trees, in their livery of dark green, stood as sentinels at the gate, and alternate columns of fragrant eglantine and the luxuriant white rose were trained from the basement to the eaves. It was environed by three large gardens, each of which enchanted my childhood, and even now linger with me, as those of the Hesperides." Then follow four pages of description of these gardens, in which she has placed flowers and fruits so numerous, that our un-flowery and unimaginative mind can scarcely believe there are so many in the world. We have passed that "spacious but not lofty" mansion many times in the course of our life, but it never seemed to us precisely as it does here; and we hardly suppose the majority of readers of the volume, who have never seen the place, would infer from the description, that the court-yard, with its velvet turf and sentinel trees, was, in the extreme

distance from door to gate, perhaps twelve to fifteen feet in length, or that the three environing gardens were owing to the fact that the house was located near the middle of one side of a large lot, and that the land, on either side of it, and in the rear, was so cultivated, that there was an extended place for flowers and fruits, as well as vegetables. And yet, when we come down to the language of ordinary life, this is the simple statement of the case. A little thing, indeed, this is, to which we have alluded, but the book is made up of little things, and as this occurs on the second page, and is a sample of a large portion of the book, we quote it as proving what we have been maintaining. We think our worthy friends, the present inmates of this ancient mansion, as they trace the glowing picture, will scarcely dream that they are reading a simple narrative, and yet, at the end of the prolonged account, the authoress begs forgiveness for its minute detail, fearing that it "may seem dry and prosaic." With confidence we say to our doubting and unbelieving friends,—Mrs. Sigourney was a poet. If this description seemed prose to her, as she wrote it, she must have been no ordinary poet.

The story of the family who dwelt within the house is told much after the same—to her "dry prosaic," but to us highly poetic—style. It consisted of a venerable widow lady, of the name of Lathrop, one of the old New England aristocracy, whom one of the recent newspaper reviewers of this volume, bewildered doubtless by the glowing description, has supposed to have been a relative of the authoress, but whom the authoress does not speak of in this way,—and of her own father, Mr. Ezekiel Huntley, with his family. Her father had charge of Mrs. Lathrop's grounds, and occupied some rooms in her dwelling, "the house being admirably arranged,"—as we suppose most houses are—"for the accommodation of two families." From the first mention of these names, everything moves on so smoothly and easily and imaginatively and poetically, that one almost loses sight of the individuality of the good old widow lady, and is often at an utter loss as to whether the house, and its furniture, and its library, and everything within or without it, from "Benedict Arnold, the clerk," to the cat that "gambled by her side," had anything to do

with that venerable personage, or whether they were all alike the property of Mrs. Sigourney's own family. Noting the words with careful accuracy, as we have done, we find, indeed, that Mrs. Lathrop, steadily though noiselessly, maintains her course as the presiding genius of the whole establishment, but, even with our careful reading, we are unable to determine the facts in every case. Whether, however, the one of the two parties or the other was the more prominent in all things, the kindly heart of the authoress appropriates them all to herself as the beautiful treasures of memory, and, we suppose, she may have never once dreamed, as she was writing, that she might make an erroneous impression upon the readers' minds. It is really astonishing to see how rose-colored everything is, in all her description of this early home. One would think—whether the subject be the food, or the dress, or the sports, or the work of those years—it was the very charm of rural life. We have seen something of New England farmers and their manner of living, but, by some ill-chance or other, we have never found anything so near the ideal. Even the fact, that, like many other children in later times, she was made to eat what was placed before her at her meals, is described in the following language—of a different style, we are sure, from that which would have expressed the feelings of any of the boys or girls, whom we used to know, under similar circumstances :

“ When seated at the table, I was never asked whether I liked or disliked aught that appeared there. *It never occurred to me whether I did or not. I never doubted but that I should be fed with ‘ food convenient for me.’* I was helped to what was deemed proper, and there was never any necessity, like poor Oliver Twist, to ask for more.” [The italics are ours].

She adds, with a gleam of ordinary human feeling, and, doubtless, remembering that New England farmers had on their tables, at that time, as they have now, a considerable amount of food of not very tempting character, “ it did not appear to me, from aught that I saw or heard, that the pleasure of eating was one of the main ends of existence.” The exact age at which she was, when these words were applicable to her, we are unable to determine with absolute certainty ; but it must have been somewhere between the age of four and eight or nine years, one would think, and, at that early age,

we question whether the mind of any child, except that of a future poet, would have gained precisely these ideas, in precisely this form. But hers was the mind of a future poet; and even as early as the age we have mentioned, according to her declaration, thought and even poetic "thought became her friend." Being left alone at night, from the age of three onward, to fall asleep by herself in her own chamber, she meditated with much joy. "In the intervals not given to sleep," she says,

"Thought talked with me. So delightful were its visits that I waited for and wooed it, and was displeased if slumber invaded or superseded the communion. For it sometimes brought me harmonies, and thrilled me to strange delight with rhythmical words. I believe the following was among its first gifts. Memory has, from the earliest childhood, kept it in her casket ;

' Oh King of kings ! who dwell'st among
Angelic heralds, hear my song.
Inexplicable are Thy ways,
Eternal ought to be Thy praise.'

"A new nightly visitant came with Thought, and sat in judgment on my couplets. It was Criticism. She measured the lines, and put them to her ear, like a pitch-pipe; and with regard to this specimen, suggested that in the second line 'tongue' would make a more accurate rhyme to 'among,' than the word I had chosen. I examined her decision, but adhered to my original selection. Whereupon Criticism arose and departed, and I went to sleep."

Whether all this took place as early as when she was three years old, she does not distinctly say; but, inasmuch as she adds, a few lines afterward, "As reading became almost in babyhood a necessity of existence, I was thrown upon a rather severe selection of standard authors," and then mentions,—as examples of these authors, to whose "measured dignity and even solemnity" of style and thought she had, even then, become "inured,"—Young's *Night Thoughts*, Addison's *Spectator*, Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield*, &c., &c., we suppose it must have been not long after that infantile age. If we are right in this conclusion, and if the proof of being a poet is the fact of being born so, and not made so, we think it is clearly shown, that Mrs. Sigourney was a poet. To be sure, we cannot suppress the painful doubt, as to whether this story of her three-years-old effort is not a dream of her after life, and whether, according to the actual facts, the sleep did not come

to the baby eyes before Criticism and Thought entered the apartment, rather than after these visitors had departed. But if all this could be said of her, at that time, and this seems to be the representation of the volume, she must have been born quite unlike most prosaic children. And in this connection, we are gratified to find, that she was not only born a poet, but also born an obituary poet, for, among the books alluded to above, she specifies Hervey's "Reflections [Meditations?] among the Tombs" and Gessner's "Death of Abel," as having "supplied her imagination with pleasant food."

In due season she began to attend school, and to gain all the varied acquirements and accomplishments of an education—a phrase which we feel justified in using, when we consider what she had already done before her school days commenced. The narrative runs rapidly over this part of her life, giving several interesting sketches of the persons who were her teachers, and then comes to the death of her aged friend, Mrs. Lathrop, and the great event of the journey to Hartford already mentioned,—her "first grief and first journey." The death of Mrs. Lathrop and her funeral are spoken of as sad events, as they might well be in the life of a young girl, who had long looked up to this venerable friend of nearly ninety with mingled reverence and affection. But we cannot help being especially struck with the entire centering of all things in herself, which our authoress exhibits, when she attempts to present before us these scenes. One would almost conclude that this excellent old lady had no relatives or near friends in the town, so fully does it appear as if the writer and her father and mother were the chief persons in the procession and at the services. And yet, if we are correctly informed,—indeed the authoress herself elsewhere represents it in this way,—the town was half filled with Lathrops. There were brothers, and cousins of every degree, the aristocracy of the place; and they were doubtless quite prominent on this occasion. But to her thought, as the grief was her own, so the surrounding company were as nothing, and when years had carried the scene far into the past, the poetess' mind lost sight of every one else and beheld herself as the sole sorrowing friend. The grief which overpowered her at the time of this great affliction, was the

cause of such failure of health and strength, that her parents were led to lay open her case before the family physician ; and it was his suggestion that brought about the other great event of the "first journey." This skillful physician was Dr. Philemon Tracy, a gentleman well known by the older generation of Norwich people, if we mistake not, as a sensible, but somewhat plain-spoken and blunt person, not likely at all to use language of a high-flown order. The case was set before him, in answer to his minute and careful inquiries, and he at once gave expression to his view of what was best to be done. Of course, we do not know what he said, for we have no means of knowing, but, as we are tracing out the evidence of Mrs. Sigourney's poetic imagination, we give our readers her own account. "After a thorough investigation," she says, addressing herself to the friend to whom she writes, "what do you suppose was the decision in my case? That I should be encased in soft, red flannel, and take a short journey to visit the relatives of my loved, lamented friend." Good old Dr. Philemon Tracy, on the one hand, and the expression "*encased* in soft, red flannel," on the other, are so widely apart, that no one, we presume, who ever saw him, could doubt that somewhere between the two was the point where poetry begins. But here again the authoress shows her peculiar power, for to her this seems, not poetry, but prose. "My parents," she adds, "with their excited apprehensions, might possibly, in the simplicity of this counsel, have shared the disappointment of Naaman the Syrian, who supposed the prophet would do some great thing." We cannot believe Mrs. Sigourney's parents, had they been directed to "encase" their child in flannel, would have been disappointed exactly in the same way that Naaman the Syrian was, nor do we suppose any one besides a poet would have regarded the prescription as characterized by simplicity.

The death of Mrs. Lathrop made it necessary for Mr. Huntley to move into another dwelling, and he accordingly purchased one. This second house and the life in it—the house, we must remember, of an ordinary Connecticut farmer of those days—are described in the same imaginative style as that of the revered widow lady ; though, of course, there was some-

what less of magnificence in the new abode. We have no space for long quotations, nor are they necessary. We select only two, upon which our eye has happened to fall, and which bear upon the question of her poetic genius, now under consideration. Alluding to the fact that, at this period—she being now fourteen years old—the knitting of her father's stockings had devolved upon her, she says,

"To the hose destined for my father I devoted particular attention, because short breeches and buckles being essential to the full dress of a gentleman, the encasing of the lower limbs was more conspicuous than since the easier regency of the pantaloon. [1] I took pleasure in making his ribbed, viz, knitting two stitches and seaming one, which, though a slower process, rendered them more adhesive, [1] and better revealed the symmetry of his well-shaped limbs."

Do girls of fourteen often think their thoughts in such language as this, or women of seventy imagine they thought them thus, when they were fourteen? We are not very extensively acquainted with young girls of that age, but we cannot believe that they do, if they are of the prose order. The other passage, which we cite, has reference to a poor old weaving woman, whose peach trees the neighboring boys, as boys often will, attempted to plunder.

"Her cap, yellow with smoke," the authoress says, "and face deepening to a purple tinge of wrathful emotion, might be seen protruding from her casement, as she vituperated the boys, who manifested a hazardous proximity to the garden wall. Not perfectly lamb-like was her temperament, as I judge from the shriek of the oburgations she sometimes addressed to them; while they, more quiescent, it would seem, than boy-nature in modern times, returned no rude reply."

We have spoken with reference to girls of fourteen with some hesitation, but the relation of boys to old women who owned peach trees we remember quite perfectly. We have also heard from a venerated relative, who was himself a boy in those days, concerning similar things in the time of Mrs. Sigourney's childhood. And if any of the boys, who lived in Norwich from 1791 to 1810 or from 1835 to 1845, had read this description of the occasional scenes in which they formed a conspicuous, and sometimes not very honorable part, we are sure they would have doubted their own personal identity; while, were the old woman alluded to in this passage, to have been inquired of as to whether her face "protruded from the casement," or whether she "vituperated the boys," we doubt if

she would ever have imagined that any such thing had happened. The poor persecuted and tried soul, we suppose, actually put her head out of the window and scolded the urchins; but she, unquestionably, "shrieked her objurgations" in a somewhat simple style of prose, and they, however "quiescent" they may have been before, became, as we cannot doubt, quite the opposite immediately after they had heard the first shriek.

In connection with this narrative of her childhood and girlhood's life, the authoress gives a letter descriptive of the aristocracy of the olden time, which is much in the same glowing style, but as it has reference to the two leading families who divided between them the glory of the town in those days—the Lathrops and the Huntingtons—it has much of interest, and with another letter that is devoted to the social amusements, &c., to which she was herself accustomed, quite carries the reader back to see the mode of living and daily habits of society sixty or seventy years ago. But we cannot stop to call attention more particularly to these letters, for we have lingered too long already upon this portion of her life. We only remark, that our knowledge of the scenes and circumstances of the old town and of the history, leads us to feel that the authoress, in the excess of her joyous memories and poetic inspiration, has thrown a somewhat unreal charm over the simple facts, and that she has unwittingly described herself, as regards this matter, in her description of one of her faithful and excellent colored servants, who lived with her in Hartford for twenty-five years. "Some faults she had," Mrs. Sigourney states, "arising from an active imagination, *sometimes overstepping the reality of circumstances.*" We feel disposed, however, as far as possible, to pardon the fault, for we all find the past gathering a bright halo around it, and Mrs. Sigourney has such perfect good will towards every one else, and is so full of happy recollections herself, that we are almost glad to deceive ourselves into the belief that it was all quite as rose-colored as she represents. Indeed, we have only considered this earlier section of the book as bearing upon the question of her style and poetic gift. And here would we leave the subject, only we cannot refrain from inserting at this point several

other quotations from later portions of the volume, which may fitly close our argument to prove she was a poet. For example, in her description of the residence of Mr. Sigourney, on Asylum street, Hartford, just on the outer limits of the city as it then was, she has the following:

"It (the mansion) was environed by an extensive lawn, whose curving gravel walks were adorned with shrubbery, and by spacious gardens, one of which stretched downward to the fair river that girdled the domain, from which it was protected by a mural parapet."

By these closing words we suggest, though with a want of confidence becoming in one who comes no nearer to a poet than a relationship by marriage, that the authoress probably means a stone wall—quite an ordinary thing in a New England landscape, which we have, ourselves even, often seen without thinking of it as a "mural parapet." But perhaps we never saw exactly what the authoress is here describing, and so we ought to put our remark in such a form as to say that, if she did not mean a stone wall, we have no idea what she did mean. But supposing she did mean a stone wall, how poetic is the manner in which she describes it;—how much more charming is the impression which she produces upon the reader's mind! Why, the old house we once lived in ourselves, in Norwich, had, according to this way of putting things, five gardens and at least two mural parapets. But those worthy men and women of the former generations, who lived there in so much comfort for so many years—we are truly sorry for their ignorance—lived and died under the erroneous idea that those parapets were mere walls. What simple, ordinary people those ancestors of ours were! We do not wonder they left us no inheritance of poetry.

Again, the authoress, in alluding to the stream mentioned in the last quoted extract, says:

"At one point it exhibited a slight cascade, and at another seemed to have a lake-like termination, neither of which gave the slightest indication of the torrent-fury of which it was once in a year capable, when, swollen and disturbed by the attrition of the dissolving spring-ices, [!] it rushed onward like a maniac."

We have, on many occasions, seen—as many others to whom we commend this volume doubtless have—this small stream, which, to us who have lived in Norwich and New Haven all our lives, does not seem anything but a very small stream, and

we gladly confirm the testimony of the distinguished writer, that it has never, at those times, "given the slightest indication of torrent-fury." But we were not there, we suppose, on the appointed anniversary, and we scarcely could expect that to an ordinary and respectful visitor from abroad, it would act "like a maniac."

Again, speaking of the grounds and the animals, she says :

"Two fair cows, with coats brushed to a satin sleekness, ruminated at will, and filled large pails with creamy nectar."

Also :

"Our poultry peopled their territory with a prolific zeal, and *manifestly gave us their eggs, their offspring, and themselves.*" [!] [The italics are ours].

And again :

"Snowy turkeys strutted amid the green turf, those of the masculine genus spreading their broad plumage with a peacock's vanity."

We wonder, as we read the book, whether the noble and dignified lord of this fair and large domain always walked about his grounds and among his self-sacrificing and ruminating domestic animals on a pair of high stilts. The volume, unfortunately, does not give us information on this important point.

On pages 273-5, in the same chapter with the passages just cited, she has the following :

"It was accordant with the rural element in the character of us both, [herself and her husband], that a portion of the family subsistence should be drawn from our own cultivated soil. This we considered both congenial to health and that consciousness of independence which is one of the pleasantest parts of a life of agriculture."

This is poetical certainly, for in prose it means—in our own case, for instance, it would mean—we concluded to get our vegetables from our own garden, instead of buying them, because they were cheaper, better, and more easily obtained than those in market.

Again :

"Our trees of the peach, pear and apple, apricot and cherry genus, were so exuberant in their gifts, that neither by usufruct, nor donation, [!] could they be always expended."

The natural course to be taken under such circumstances

will readily occur to our readers as one which they have themselves not unfrequently adopted; quite a common and prosaic thing to their minds, no doubt. And yet here it is set forth in the following striking language:

"The resource was in casting them to a class of retainers, whose name, for some reason or other, perhaps for none at all, is scarcely admissible to ears polite."

It ought to be said, however, that the authoress elsewhere defends this useful animal against the common prejudice, with kindness, indeed, but again in rather glowing words:

"I could never understand why it should be an offense to delicacy to utter the name of an animal, which the Evangelists have recorded on their pages as plunging in a dense herd down a steep place into the sea, and perishing in the waters." [We have once or twice inserted an exclamation mark at the close of Mrs. Sigourney's sentences: we think at least two might be inserted here, as expressive of the reader's feeling in view of the remarkable aptness and force of this reference to the New Testament.] "Such treatment," she goes on to say, "is peculiarly ungrateful in a people who allow this scorned creature to furnish a large part of their subsistence, to swell the gains of commerce, and to share with the monarch of ocean the honor of lighting their evening lamp." "Our creed in this matter is more inconsistent than that of the Jews—for we do not hesitate to profit by his death, though we have made his life despicable."

And once again, alluding to the interior life of this noble mansion, she remarks:

"Soon after our removal to this delightful abode, my husband confided to me that, from some obstructions in the course of mercantile prosperity, [the inquiry suggests itself here, whether the authoress means that Mr. Sigourney failed, but we are unable to say; he was, evidently, *obstructed*, but as we have never known any merchant whose case was described by this word, we cannot tell precisely what his condition was.] added to the expenses of building, which are wont to exceed their original estimate, a system of retrenchment would be expedient, perhaps imperative. Concurring with his proposition, I sought how it might best be put in force, without involving palpable inconsistency in the habits of so costly a dwelling; and having seen some examples of a successful union of economy with hospitality, determined to become a learner and disciple. I steadfastly set myself against waste in every domestic department, and also to prolong the existence of all garments, by repair or transmigration."

Many, if not most, of our readers, as we suppose, in their childhood, endured what they often considered the hard fate of wearing the old clothes of their parents, or elder brothers or sisters, which had been made over as new for themselves. Did they ever dream that this process, which they grieved over

and the end of which they hoped and longed for as the time of beginning a happier life, was a "prolonging of the existence of these garments by transmigration?"

But we forbear. If the doubter is not convinced by all this which we have just quoted from a single letter, and by all that we had cited before, that our authoress was, indeed, gifted with poetic genius, we bid him read the book for himself; and then if its four hundred pages do not remove all his doubts, all we can say is, that he must be in the depths of prejudice. We confess that our doubts are entirely gone, and we record the fact, with pleasure, on these pages of the *New Englander*—with especial pleasure, because we once lived in Norwich, and the good poetess bewails the little appreciation of her writings in that well-remembered town. In summing up her literary career, near the close of the volume, she says:

"Letters of appreciation have reached me from crowned heads—from the King of Prussia, the Empress of Russia, and the late Queen of France; marks of favor from nobles of high degree; and what was to me still more animating, from monarchs in the realm of mind. I have felt humbled by such distinctions, as transcending my merits. Some degree of chastening counterpoise has arisen from the marked indifference of my native city, which I have loved almost with the fervor of the ancient Jews for Zion. Neither by word nor smile can I recollect that she has fostered the mental labors of the child who went out from her fair borders, leaving her heart behind. Sweet hospitalities she extends to me, but in the point where I yearn for her sympathy, or would fain lay my honors at her feet, she keeps silence."

And then she adds—evidently stumbling upon the fatal mistake of both recording and making the severest criticism ever passed upon her: "I wrote, by request, a lyric to be sung at the anniversary of her favorite academy, which the chief musician scornfully declined to perform, and *it was read among the prose exercises.*" [The italics are our own].

With especial pleasure, therefore, do we record our conviction here, that Mrs. Sigourney was a poet. We hope our course will be some slight compensation to her memory for the scornful action of the aforesaid Norwich musician, for, as he placed her lyric poem among the prose pieces, we on the other hand class her prose narrative among the works of poetry; and speaking of them both "with a word and a smile," we

make them the means of finally deciding the question, which has been so long and so fruitlessly discussed.

And now, having indulged ourselves in some remarks upon the style of our authoress, which our readers, we are sure, will admit the justice of, if they read the volume, we turn to the other leading question that was proposed for discussion at the outset. This question has reference to the work and character of the distinguished woman, who is at once the author and subject of this volume. It is always, after the earthly career of any person is ended, the most interesting inquiry which we can raise—what, in its main features and characteristics, was the life that has been passing before us, and has now passed out of our sight; what has been accomplished, and what was the hope at the end? As we read these letters, which tell the story of the life we are now considering, we have a full and most pleasing answer to this all-important inquiry.

Mrs. Sigourney's life may almost be said to be symbolized by that journey in the Hartford stage, with its beginning and its ending, to which we have already alluded. Born and living through the period of her childhood and youth in Norwich, as we have seen, she took her course, in her early womanhood, to what she calls the semi-capital of the State, and in Hartford she lived and labored to the end. The narrative of her course thus seems, as it were, to be naturally divided into two parts by this eight hours' ride, which, though often taken, she only describes as she remembered it from the earliest experience. We have, in endeavoring to establish her character as a poet, passed hurriedly over the main events of her life in the former of these two cities. The story now carries us to her residence in the latter; and as we speak of her work and character, we shall pass it briefly in review. She commenced her career in Hartford as the head of a small school for girls, in the establishment of which she was greatly assisted by the late widely-known and highly-honored benefactor of that city, Daniel Wadsworth, Esq. The "young ladies" who attended this school, at least at the beginning of its history, were, as we judge, few in numbers, and from the families of Mr. Wadsworth's friends. They were all, if we may make our inference

from several passages in the volume, quite young in years. But as time moved on, and her success became manifest, she enlarged her company so as to include those who were at a somewhat higher stage of development. The chapter on her "educational remembrances" is, in our view, one of the most interesting in the book, as it is also one of the simpler ones in its style. The proof of her skill and many qualifications as a teacher is clearly seen in the explanation which she gives of her method, as well as in the reasonable and advanced ideas of teaching which she evidently cherished. We must remember that this was fifty years ago—for she went to Hartford in 1813 or 1814—and was, accordingly, before the improved system of modern times in the domain of teaching had begun to be known or thought of; a system, indeed, which is full of defects, and in which everything is to a highly injurious extent, in our judgment, sacrificed to mere rules and routine, but which, beyond all doubt, as a whole is much superior to that of our fathers and grandfathers. Mrs. Sigourney was in advance of her age. She was, as we think she fully proves by her story, a valuable, inspiring, interesting, self-sacrificing, and loving instructor; ever considering how she might best awaken and cultivate and stimulate her pupils, without at all overstraining or too early straining their mental powers. She seems to have studied continually the capabilities of each mind under her charge, and to have kept ever in view the duties belonging to the sphere of woman into which they must afterward enter. Her system of rewards and penalties, considering the age of her scholars at the first, was, as we think, a good one—not one, indeed, that could be universally adopted in larger schools or among all classes of children, but very judicious, and well calculated to secure the end in view, where the young girls were few in numbers and were all members of friendly families, and thus almost as the children of one household. She remarks, also, upon the especial pains she took to encourage those amiable dispositions which are so essential to the true womanly character, and tells of the simple way which she determined upon to excite emulation among her pupils in regard to this matter. The votes of all the scholars were taken at the close of each term, as the expression of the common

judgment upon the question, as to which one among them had most uniformly and perfectly manifested kindness and gentleness in all her intercourse with her associates. These votes, which were sealed ballots, were to be given, as she charged them, conscientiously, and, in such a class, doubtless they were so given; and then the votes being counted, the one who had received the largest number was crowned by the rest as "their chosen Queen, the loved of all." We might cite passages from this chapter, did our space allow, but it is scarcely necessary for the purpose which we have in view. Suffice it to say, that, though she is her own herald, we read this interesting letter, describing the work of her first five years in Hartford, with the feeling that she did her work well, and that she rightfully looked back upon it, over the half century that had passed, with heartfelt satisfaction. The same feeling seems to have been in the minds of those who had far better means of judging than any mere reader of the volume can have, and who trace back their own history to the early times when they were themselves her pupils; for, year by year, for forty-five years, they met together to celebrate with their honored teacher the days of their association in the school-room, and to repeat their generous testimony to the good she had bestowed upon them.

Mrs Sigourney seems to have been born a teacher, quite as certainly, to say the least, as she was born a poet. Even in those early days, when, as we have seen, at the age of from three to six years Thought and Criticism were her nightly visitors, she tells us that there came to her mind "vivid pencilings of the delight, dignity, and glory of a school-mistress," and that thereupon she "arranged her dolls in various classes, instructing them not only in the scanty knowledge she had herself attained, but boldly exhorting and lecturing them on the higher moral duties." This desire of teaching continued likewise through the years that followed, until while she was still quite young, she began the work, and with two scholars—the only two she was able to secure after much solicitation—she established her first school in one of the rooms of her father's house. An impulse which retains its power so long a time, and in spite of such discouragements, is generally a clear indication of the fitness of the mind for that work to which

the impulse urges it. And surely, in her case, this fitness was abundantly proved in after years, by the success of her labors in Hartford which we have just set forth.

As we pass on from this brief notice of her educational recollections, to consider the subsequent portions of her life, we pause a moment to refer to the suggestion which she makes, as the result of her experience and observation as a teacher, that the "love of arithmetic is not indigenous in the female mind." She claims for herself, indeed, that it was to her own mind always a favorite science, but with her pupils it was otherwise. We had not ourselves supposed this, which is thus given as her conclusion, to be the fact in general, but we do not know that it can be considered a very strange thing if it be so, for the slow processes of calculation may be somewhat foreign to the quickness with which woman's mind loves to move forward to its results. As for ourselves, we are ready to say, that we have great patience with all persons, whether women or men, who do not give themselves enthusiastically to this particular study, for the great privilege and blessing of the freedom of mature years, as compared with the bondage of childhood under tutors and governors, has often seemed to us largely to consist in two things—first, in the fact that it is no longer necessary to distress ourselves about punctuation, as we once did; and secondly, in the fact that we shall never again, during our earthly pilgrimage, be compelled to tell how long, if a hare has the start of a dog, but does not run quite so fast, it will take the dog to catch the hare. We always pitied the hare when we were at school, and had no sympathy with the dog; and now that we have long since entered on the busy work of the world, we have a sincere and almost daily satisfaction—though we confess it is not unmingled even yet with astonishment—that most men are necessarily so occupied with other things, as even to be oblivious of the fact that the dog is still in the pursuit, and that some men—men too of high character and of great service to society—are in such ignorance of arithmetic as to be unable to answer this question, so perplexing, and, as it once seemed, so absolutely essential to any useful development of the mental powers.

Our authoress was now at the age of twenty-eight. She had settled in her own mind the great question of duty to remain unmarried, on account of the advancing years and consequent dependent condition of her parents, and she had no doubt that the work of a teacher was to be the work of her life. But the future is little known to any of us, and certainly it is little known to those who are only twenty-eight. Destiny, from the beginning, had been pointing in a direction quite opposite to her thought, and of course, her thought finally turned round and pointed just where destiny ordered. "The blind archer," as she says, "bided his time." When the time came, he shot his arrow, and with surprising effect. We have rarely heard of a more sudden or fatal case. It seems to us, as related, beyond almost anything in real life, that has ever come within the circle of our knowledge. But we leave her to tell her own story. After having spoken of her resolutions above alluded to, and of the fact that she had resisted the offers of several clerical gentlemen, and even "fascinations of a more ambitious character," she says :

"Nevertheless as I plodded my way to and from my school-house, a pair of deep-set and most expressive black eyes sometimes encountered mine, and spoke unutterable things. They were the property of a gentleman of striking physiognomy and the elegant manners of the olden school. Their dialect might [!] not have made a lasting impression on one whose every thought and faculty were bespoken by her daily occupation; but ere long a letter came [!]¹—a letter of touching eloquence and the fairest chirography. From this there was no escape. [!] It was like a grappling-iron, not to be evaded. Wherever I turned, its words followed me as living creatures—an image of the wheel seen by the entranced prophet, full of eyes, that gazed wherever he went. To love-letters I had been no stranger, yet nothing like this appeal had caused such perturbation and captivity of thought. Its writer I had occasionally met in select parties, with his wife, a being of angelic loveliness and beauty, who had gone to a higher and congenial sphere." [!]

We ask our readers to notice carefully this remarkable paragraph, and see *what* were the *overpowering attractions* of this person who surpassed the clergymen previously referred to, and scattered the serious and determined resolutions. It occurs to us that if any of these disappointed clerical gentlemen are still living,—(who were not only less attractive than the predestined conqueror was, but even so far less attractive, that, between their level and his, there were others having "fascinations of

a more ambitious character," and if they have opportunity to trace out the details of the picture of their successful rival, which is here drawn by the one whose "slight bark," as she says, "though sometimes veering" towards them, was yet "guided to keep its pole-star in view,"—they must ever hereafter have a most becomingly humble estimation of themselves. But we forbear to make further comment upon the passage, except to say that the prophet Ezekiel, we presume, never thought of such an application of his vision—and to protest against the publication of such a story of her love affairs by the friends of any woman, who has successfully finished her earthly career. Even if the authoress had requested its publication, we think her surviving friends ought to have interposed, for surely she could not, six months after her death, have desired it.

In due season she was married to the gentleman, a portion of whose property was the pair of black eyes, and one of whose chief recommendations seems to have been his fair chirography; and she settles down in his elegant mansion as the wife of Mr. Charles Sigourney. The story of her life as related to him seems to us to be skillfully and admirably told. The question involuntarily rises in our mind, when we come to the record of his death a long time afterward, whether the eyes had always during those years shone as beautifully and kindly as they did at first, and whether chirography had, after all, proved to be the noblest qualification of the manly life. But it is a question which finds no answer in the book, and we find ourselves asking it not because of what the kindly writer suggests, but because, in a case of so sudden, and as it would seem to us, at least at the beginning, so groundless an attachment, we can hardly escape the desire to know the result in after times. A woman's love is the noblest thing in this selfish world; for it gives itself wholly, confidently, without a single doubt, and for all time, to the man who joins his hand with hers, and then, even if the long years that follow are but the continual proof that he is not what she thought him on her marriage day, she buries his every failing from the eyes of the harsh and curious world. We honor the woman who writes these letters, whatever may have been the ending

of the early dream. And if we smile with our readers at the story of her commencing love, it is for the reason that we cannot help it,—and this, not, indeed, because it is the story of her love, but because it is *such a story*;—while, as we smile, it is with a generous feeling of true respect for the way in which the love guides the story afterward.

After the account of the marriage, the chapter on “Domestic Life” gives the description of her dwelling, some passages from which we have already cited, and then relates pleasantly the ordinary daily duties of a New England house-keeper. The birth of her children, and the removal to her house of her parents, who left their old home in Norwich at Mr. Sigourney’s suggestion, filled her mind as well as her time with new cares and thoughts. For eighteen years her life passed on in this quiet way, marked, like every woman’s life, with so little that can be told of to the world, and yet with so much that is noble and pure,—with so much that is full of kindness, and is quite as essential to the world’s happiness as any of the more conspicuous works on which men pride themselves. How strange it is that,—while, in regard to almost every life, the richest part, and that which works its way in sweetest and gentlest influences into other lives, and helps them grow in all goodness toward the kingdom of heaven, is the part which is never opened to the world’s view—we always deceive ourselves and measure true glory only by the outward and visible things! And so we often or always fail to honor the life of quiet service as we ought, and even lose the beautiful development of the inner soul in our all-absorbing pursuit of fame.

The “Lapse of Years”—for this is the title of the next chapter—brought many changes;—the change of residence, the change of circumstances, and the change of death as it came to those around her, until finally she was left alone, to work out the rest of her appointed mission and to wait for the end. These years brought her the great privilege of a visit to Europe; great to every educated man or woman, but especially so to one who, having long since found a place among the company of authors and poets in her own person, was thereby enabled, as she entered their own homes, to commune with

them as a kindred spirit. But the "pleasant memories" of those "pleasant lands" beyond the ocean, she says, she will not attempt to recall on her present pages, since they have been already recorded in another volume, whose title, expressed in these very words, makes known how greatly she enjoyed the privilege. The latest season of her life is then pictured in a letter full both of thankfulness for the past and hope for the future—a letter which opens with the heartiest farewell, addressed to the friend to whom she had been writing so many times, while it closes with thoughts most characteristic of herself,—as hopeful and grateful as her life had been. "Behind me stretch the green pastures and still waters, by which I have been led all my days. Around, is the lingering of hardy flowers and fruits that bide the winter. Before, stretches the shining shore. The shadowy valley between seems not worthy to come into remembrance. Past, present, and future, concur like three harmonies. May their grateful ascription never end!" The passing of the "shadowy valley between" needed the pen of another to tell its story. It was filled with gentle ministrations and the ever-returning round of daily duties, until she gradually lost the life of earth and entered upon that of heaven.

Such was her work—one that was so faithfully and well accomplished, that it deserves to be spoken of with all honor by those who read her recorded history. Of her character alone it remains to say a few words. We only intend, as indeed we are only able, to speak of this as we discover it from the pages of the volume before us. Her one great weakness, as it here displays itself, seems to have been vanity. It was, however, a harmless kind of vanity, which not only was not injurious to any one else, but even was not offensive. It was with Mrs. Sigourney, as we judge, as it was with a prominent man, whom we knew in former years, who seemed to be free from all unkindness of feeling or jealousy, largely because he thought himself a little in advance of all others. She was not overbearing, or even exactly self-conceited in the ordinary sense. But she unwaveringly and always felt that she was the leading woman in any company, wheresoever she might be present. This was an accepted and fundamental truth of life

with her, concerning which there was neither any doubt in her own mind, nor, as she supposed, in the mind of any other. Accordingly, she felt as kindly toward everybody around her as it was possible for a human soul to feel. Why be jealous of another—why fail to take pleasure in the success and elevation of another, if the limit of such elevation be a point which is just below oneself? It is impossible to do otherwise than “rejoice with them that do rejoice,” when the soul is perpetually in this perfect calm of satisfaction. And as it does no harm to ourselves, for a person who is always overflowing with good will toward us and good wishes for us, to be resting in contentment in view of his own surpassing greatness, we only smile at the rich and rosy self-approbation of such an one. We pass our own judgment indeed upon him, as we do upon every other, but we never desire to break the bubble of his vanity.

We cannot help thinking, however, that there was some other quality mingled in Mrs. Sigourney’s vanity, or something else closely united with it. If the book we are examining shows anything upon its very face it is artificiality of style, and we must believe that a person who could write, as the author of this book writes, must have had a certain artificial element pervading her life in no inconsiderable degree. We can easily realize how she might have contemplated her rural mansion and fair domain with satisfaction, but we confess our inability to see how a mind of natural simplicity could picture the domain or the mansion either to itself or to others, as she has done. Instead of living quietly on the earth, as ordinary people do, it seems to us she must have been, a large portion of the time, in the upper regions of the air, or, if we may be permitted to use, in regard to her own inner life, an expression which she applies to her domestic animals, we think she must have “leaped and luxuriated” more than most of us common mortals do.

But we gladly turn aside from her weaknesses. Her kindness to all was as conspicuous as the harmless vanity with which it was connected. She had, beyond all question, a kind heart by nature. This gift had been given to her at the beginning in large measure, and it overflowed in its fullness on every

side, through all the years. It is really striking to see how in terms of generous commendation she speaks of every one of her own sex, whom she has occasion to introduce into her letters,—from Mrs. Catherine N. Toucey, who is described as “having continued” from the time when she was one of the authoress’ pupils “to advance in loveliness and intellectual attainment, having been distinguished at the court of our nation, where for years her lot was cast, by those graces of manner and conversation that lent attraction to her example of piety,” to the faithful black woman who lived with her so long, and the account of whose services and excellent qualities she closes with the words—“Thus was I favored with this heart-service for a period of twenty-five years; as long as age and disease permitted her to make any effort. Her image is still vivid before me, and I cherish it with tenderness. She was to me as my own flesh and blood.” Her early teachers are praised, almost without a word of slightest disparagement, and her chance acquaintances are represented only in the most pleasing light. With a similar feeling, when she comes to commend the successive clergymen who had ministered to her spiritual wants in the church whose services she ordinarily attended, she seems to think that all others must be likewise commended, and, with a sentence or two for each one, she shows the good will that abounds towards all. * She entered the Episcopal Church because her husband was a member of it, but, unlike many others who become Episcopalians by the converting process of marriage, she did not forget that there are other Christian churches. “The longer I live,” she says, “the more inclined I am deeply to regret that those differences of doctrine and form, which must always exist, should be permitted to disturb their Christian charity who embrace the precepts of the same Gospel, and pray to dwell at last lovingly in the presence of one Redeemer, in purer light and perfect unity.” And her unaffected and warm-hearted recognition of past favors is seen in the mingled reverence and love with which she recalls the thought of her old benefactress in Norwich, as well as in the following words, wherein she makes reference to the one whose aid and counsel had been the foundation of all her success in Hartford: “If the partakers of

Heaven's bliss are interested in aught that thrills these our hearts of clay, may he inhale the perfume of that warm gratitude which the lapse of almost half a century has neither dampened nor repressed."

Her kindness was also exhibited as constantly in deeds as it was in words. She seems to have been always thoughtful in the way of little attentions to others—the little things that pleasantly recall friends to mind—and for the poor and for children she was always ready with needful and helpful gifts. From the year 1811, her daughter remarks, "when, from her engagement as a teacher, she first had an income of her own, the plan was marked out that one-tenth of all that she received should be given in charity—a plan from which she never deviated throughout her life, except to enlarge the measure of her gifts. She had proved what Goldsmith calls 'the luxury of doing good,' and desired, with her last words, to commend it to others."

Mrs. Sigourney, as the volume presents her to our thoughts, was a woman of much strength of character,—of such a combination of gentleness and firmness as adapted her for the work to which she gave her earlier years,—and of such uprightness as to command the respect of those who knew her in the intimacy of friendship. The entire absence of all words of censure on the part of those who were associated with her during her long years of residence in Hartford, is the best commendation of her prudence and forbearance and charity in her own home; while the public honors showed at the time of her burial, prove that she died in universal esteem for her private and social virtues.

Two things more were noticeable in her character, and they will serve to complete our view of it. She was an enthusiastic, diligent worker in the sphere which was assigned to her, or which she had chosen for herself; and a joyful, trustful, thankful follower of Christ. The chapter on Literature, near the close of the volume, shows—whatever different persons may say of the excellence of her poetry—that her's was no idle or inactive mind, while the amusing list of requests that were presented to her from every quarter, for every kind of service, is a scarcely less convincing proof that she was always ready to

do whatever was within the limits of her power. And as for her Christian life; from the time when, at three years of age, she says of herself that she felt no fear, since the "Father in Heaven, to whom the last words of closing day were said, seemed near," and she "fell asleep as on His protecting arm," until, in the closing days of her life, as she drew near to the age of seventy-five, she called to her thought the words, "In the fainting away of my life, I will think upon Jehovah, and He shall send forth strength for me from His Holy Temple;" no doubt or apprehension appears to have entered her soul for a single moment. The world seemed full of God's gifts and of Divine beauty to her thought, and she herself seemed, as one of His own children, to be the object of His constant and infinite love. We confess that, after our hearty and good-natured laugh, we closed the volume for the last time, with a tender regard for the gifted authoress, and with a sincere joy in the confident belief that another soul had proved the truth of the eternal promise, and had entered into the great and glorious company of the ransomed ones.

Our review of the volume has been like the impression produced upon us by its perusal. We laughed at first, and perhaps immoderately. The stilted and absurd style is beyond anything we have read for years. The geese are swans, indeed, and the roses rosier than any which nature paints. It is, we are bound to say, simply ridiculous to speak of stone walls as "mural parapets," and the making over of old clothing as a "prolonging of the existence of garments by transmigration." It is worse than ridiculous to use such language soberly, in letters professing to be written in the simplicity and confidence of private friendship. It is even an outrage on all propriety, to put forth such a book as a proper one for young writers of either sex to imitate, because the authoress was a distinguished poet. And if criticism is worth anything, or the pages of a journal like this have any purpose in the world, such style ought to be sharply rebuked. We have laughed because we could not help it. We have set forth before our readers what they will find on every page of the volume, in about the same measure, and have tried to give them something of

our appreciation of the ludicrous element in it. But we protest once more, that we have written the earlier portion of our Article with no ill-will—with not the slightest intermingling of unkindliness in our joyous laugh. And we trust that the latter portion has been hearty and serious enough in its appreciation and approbation of the writer, for what she was and for what she did, to prove even to her own friends the truth of our protestation.

We commend the volume to every reader of these pages. He will be amused by the style; and entertained by the account of the olden time; and charmed by the good nature of the authoress; and softened into tenderness of soul by the story of the way in which God led her home to Himself, through all the comforts and trials—through all the joys and sorrows—through all the discipline and experience of a long and well-spent life.

We add a single word more. Mrs. Sigourney, we believe, was by no means deserving of the censure thrown upon her poetry by so many persons in our country. She was not, as we frankly confess, a poet of a very high order. She unconsciously shows, even in these Letters, the inferiority of her own poetry by her occasional introduction of brief passages from those who have written under a true inspiration. She has a sameness in all her productions, which is wearisome. She evidently knows more of religion than she does of the Muses. She has committed the almost intolerable evil of publishing a volume containing from fifty to one hundred obituary sonnets. In a word, she is Mrs. Sigourney. But she was one of the first among American women to venture within the poetic field; and, while she has led the way, she deserves not only the praise awarded to a pioneer, but the praise of a fair measure of success. We think even the Norwich people might well honor their own prophet, by acknowledging her gifts;—though, at the same time, we can scarcely believe that the “boy nature” will ever become so “quiescent” in us, as to prevent us from telling of or laughing over the melancholy issue of the encounter between her lyric poem and the scornful Norwich musician.

ARTICLE VII.—THE POLITICAL SITUATION.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S veto of the bill for extending and systematizing the operations of the Freedmen's Bureau, the passionate and almost revolutionary tone of his harangue to the Washington mob, in connection with the drift of his late conversations and speeches of a more informal character, have justly created disappointment and anxiety in thousands who, nevertheless, do not subscribe to Mr. Sumner's doctrine about suffrage and the idea of a "Republican" government, or find much wisdom either in the recent orations or in the recent political action of that Senator. There is no use, even if there were no impropriety, in inveighing against the President. At the same time, his course should be candidly and boldly criticised. The hardest thing that can be said of him is said by his special partisans, who require us to speak of his official conduct with bated breath, lest he should be driven into the ranks of the enemies of the country,—for the party which, during the last four years, has done everything it could, short of taking up arms, to break down the Union cause, deserves to be so styled. We do not believe that the President intends to gratify this party, yet we confess that our belief is not free from misgivings. In the brief comments which we have to offer upon the political situation, we shall endeavor to touch on the main points in controversy.

1. It is undeniable that the so-called Confederate States are not now in "practical relations" to the Union. Their inhabitants are subject to the United States, but those States, in consequence of their own act, are not in possession of their former powers and privileges as members of the Union. They went out of the Union *de facto*, if not *de jure*. On any theory of the rebellion, it swept away the State governments in the rebel Communities; and hence, provisional governments, acting through military law, were set up by national authority. In

our judgment, the contest in which we have been engaged, was a war; and while we are not deprived of the right of dealing with individuals according to municipal law, we have, in the event of success, all the rights which justly belong to the conqueror. But waiving this point, and admitting for the moment, that the rebel States did not lose their character as States, by the act of secession and of insurrection, it is still agreed that they were left without governments; and government must be reconstructed in each of them, *de novo*. It is plain that not everything claiming to be a legitimate government, in either of these States, is to be considered such. The National authority must determine the question whether a given organization shall be considered, to all intents and purposes, a State government. In other words, the whole subject of reconstruction is in the hands of the national government, and the rebel Communities must await and abide by its decision.

2. It is necessary and proper that each of these rebellious Communities should be readmitted, before it enjoys the privilege of representation in Congress. The recognition or readmission—use whatever term we will—of the State is the prior question to be determined. The policy advocated by Senator Dixon, and those who concur with him, is extremely fallacious. Their plan is to admit to Congress individuals here and there who can give evidence of personal loyalty. But the representative of a district represents the State in which that district lies. If that State is not “in good and regular standing,” as a member of the Union, no part of it is entitled to representation. The State government creates the district, and may alter its bounds to-morrow. It may draw the lines so that a loyal district or constituency shall be supplanted by a disloyal. The policy to which we refer, which is called the President’s policy, is simply a plan for *smuggling back* into the Union the late Confederate States, and for cutting off the deliberate discussion and settlement of the prior question of their fitness to resume their former places.

3. The determination of this prior question belongs pre-eminently to Congress. Congress must judge whether an organization which pretends to send Representatives and

Senators to Washington, is truly and properly a State government, entitled to representation in Congress. This power belongs to Congress, and to Congress alone. The doctrine that the Executive or some other magistrate is to determine this all-important question, which appears to be implied in the President's veto message, needs no answer since the crushing refutation which it has received from Senator Fessenden, and after it has been disowned by the President's advocates. Aside from the particular question of representation in Congress, the settlement at the end of this great conflict is rightfully in the hands of the Supreme Legislature of the land. To hold that this great work is the function of the Executive, is to endow him with power greater than is possessed by any sovereign this side of Russia. And the Senate and House of Representatives, now in session at Washington, *are* the Congress of the United States. The implication, come from whatever quarter it may, that they are not endowed with all the functions which the Constitution confers upon Congress, is treasonable, and deserves to be met with stern indignation by every good citizen. Were it well founded, the whole action of Congress, or of the body supposed to be Congress, for the last four years, would be void. A journal in New York, which claims to be respectable, speaks of the Congress of the United States as "the rump Congress." The suggestions contained in this appellation we believe to be powerless, as far as their effect on the body of the people is concerned; but they are not the less base and iniquitous. The man who, in the knowledge of what his words mean, applies that title to Congress is at heart a traitorous villain, however he may fear to carry out his words in correspondent action. The propriety of coöperative action on the part of both Houses, on the question of admitting members from the rebel States, is obvious. Neither House should assume to restore a State to its relations to the Union, independently of the other branch of the Legislature. Hence the appointment of a Joint Committee was eminently wise, and in denouncing this Committee President Johnson set a bad example.

4. It being the right of Congress to fix the terms and the manner of the restoration of the rebel States, Congress is

bound to exact of them sufficient evidences of loyalty and the best attainable guarantees for our future security ; and, also, to provide for the protection of the freedmen against injustice and wrong. It is preposterous to maintain that the moment the rebel Communities cease from organized and armed warfare upon the national government, they must be forthwith admitted to a part in the administration of it. The President himself has required of the rebel States the acceptance of the great Amendment to the Constitution for the perpetual destruction of slavery. If consent to *that* Amendment may be required, consent to other changes may also be demanded for equally good reasons. Nothing should be done in vindictiveness ; but, on the other hand, the legitimate fruits of the war should not be thrown away or put in jeopardy. Why should not security be taken, in the form of a Constitutional Amendment, that debts contracted in forwarding insurrection shall never be paid by Federal or State authority, and that the payment of the national debt shall never be resisted or in any way impeded ? • Why should not the South be precluded from disfranchising the whole black population, and at the same time reaping the benefit of them as a basis of representation ? The protection of the emancipated slaves in all civil rights should be secured beyond a peradventure. It is easy to object to the Freedmen's Bureau Bill that it introduces an anomalous class of magistrates and a somewhat arbitrary system of administration. But how shall these millions of blacks be sheltered from cruelty and oppression ? Not by Southern juries, surely, either in State or Federal courts. The South has not yet given evidence of a disposition to treat the freedmen with justice ; and this is why the Bureau is necessary. We see no means of accomplishing the end, which the nation is solemnly bound to accomplish, except by the employment, for the present, of *quasi* military magistrates in the districts where the blacks are exposed to peril, until the disaffected whites shall become reconciled to the new order of things, and learn to treat their former slaves as freemen. The securing of their civil rights to the blacks ought never to be confounded with the question whether the right to vote shall be conferred upon

them. Without doubt, the more intelligent of the former slaves may safely and wisely be entrusted with this privilege ; and it is unjust to debar men from political advantages on account of the color of their skin. We protest, however, against Mr. Sumner's doctrine of universal suffrage. The distinction between natural and political rights must not be ignored. Society exists for the protection of natural rights ; political rights, society confers. The statesmen who framed the Constitution were not generally advocates of universal suffrage. Nor, we may remark, is it of any avail for Mr. Sumner to pick out sentences from Locke and Sidney, Samuel Adams or Jefferson, on the foundation of society and the social compact, with the design of fastening upon the constitution his idea of the essentials of a Republican government. The practice of the framers of the Constitution overthrows all his theoretical reasoning on this point. If a State is republican while holding a part of its people in slavery, it is at least equally republican when it has clothed these slaves with civil rights, even though the privilege of voting is denied them. It is important that the reserved rights of the States, in relation to the powers of the General Government, should remain substantially as they were before the war. The war has annihilated the false dogma of secession and slavery with it. The main thing to be required of the rebel States is proofs and guarantees of absolute loyalty, and of a disposition to give to the former slaves the substance and not the mere shadow of freedom.

5. This brings us back to the grounds of complaint against President Johnson. He has apparently failed to sympathize with the Union party in Congress in the desire to extort reasonable guarantees on the points which we have touched upon above. He has set himself against deliberations and measures looking to this result. Owing to his course, the prospect of reaching a solid, righteous, and beneficent settlement of the great conflict, is somewhat clouded. Moreover, his improper rebukes of Congress, official and unofficial, and his undignified abuse of "the radicals," have done great mischief at the South, by awakening the old defiant, insolent

spirit which the events of the war had humbled and silenced, and which might have been exorcised forever. We hope that President Johnson will be faithful to the interests which the Union party have at heart. If he proves to be, he will receive their cordial support; but if he does not, he will encounter the opposition of the great body of that party, who have no selfish motives to sway their political action, and who are too intelligent to "endorse" the men who betray their cause.

Since the foregoing remarks were put in type, Mr. Johnson's veto of the bill granting Civil Rights to the Freedmen, and his ambiguous position with reference to the Connecticut election, which served to stimulate and strengthen the opposition party in the State, have revealed more clearly his views and designs. By declaring that the freedmen are not citizens, he has placed himself in conflict with the cherished sentiments and resolute policy of the great Union party. The demagogical references to our "foreign population," are plainly adapted to inflame still further that unchristian and cruel hostility to the blacks which the greater portion of them already feel. The doctrines and the spirit of this message are alike repugnant to the immovable convictions of the powerful and intelligent party which raised Mr. Johnson to his high office. Against these established convictions, Mr. Johnson will struggle in vain; and if he perseveres in his present line of conduct, we firmly believe that, whatever temporary mischief he may do, he will at length sink under the weight of that determined resistance and indignant condemnation which he will receive at the hands of a betrayed people.

ARTICLE VIII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

ELLICOTT ON PHILIPPIANS, COLOSSIANS, AND PHILEMON.—This volume completes the series of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles by this author, the republication of which in our country was promised in 1860. We now have, within reach of all persons even of quite limited means, the best English work of this character on all the writings of the Apostle, with the exception of the Epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. No minister or Biblical student ought to be without the set,—which we see, by the publisher's recent advertisement, can be purchased, in two volumes, for ten dollars,—for these commentaries supply a place that is filled by no others. Indeed, there is scarcely anything to be found in our language, bearing upon the interpretation of most, if not all, of the Epistles covered by these books, which is of any very great value. And we cannot but regard the author as more worthy of the name of scholar, than any other among his countrymen who has of late years entered upon the same field and published the results of his studies. He seems to us, more nearly than any other, to approach the scholarly commentators of Germany, and to have begun upon a course, in which we trust others will follow him, until our own language shall furnish us with works which may rival in excellence those of that land of scholars.

Bishop Ellicott's commentaries are all written upon the same plan, so that a person who has used any of them will know what he may expect to find in all the rest. They are, as they profess to be, critical and grammatical—even in the highest degree grammatical, and dryly so. It seems to us that, in the reading of Meyer, who is as thoroughly of this character as any German commentator, we find far less of this dryness and far more of interest, far more that would induce a person to read on for a few pages beyond the single verse or point which he happened to be exam-

* *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon: with a Revised Translation.* By Rt. Rev. CHARLES J. ELLICOTT, D. D., Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 1865. 8vo. pp. 278.

ining. These works of Ellicott are very concise in their style—remarkably and felicitously so, but yet with something of the same accompanying fault. No writer, in any language, is more concise than De Wette, but we think the student of his well-known writings will find more that is suggestive and quickening than our author gives us. Of course we do not expect to read a commentary through in course, or to find it very interesting in and of itself, any more than we do in the case of a dictionary, but it actually seems as if this writer had studiously and carefully limited himself, in this regard, within the narrowest bounds, and had, with fixed determination, excluded all that might awaken and inspire the mind, as if this were altogether outside of the proprieties of his sphere. We have alluded to this characteristic of Ellicott's works, on a former occasion, on the pages of the *New Englander*, but it impresses us the more with every new volume which reaches us. In books of this kind, indeed, it is a minor fault. The possibilities of the opposite character are not large in a critical and grammatical commentary; we may add, that the *possibilities* are the *only thing* that is large in most practical commentaries. The Bishop has written so much, and has adhered so closely to his one original plan, that we hardly anticipate any change, in this respect, if he continues his labors in his chosen field; and we hardly know whether anything, that we may say, would impress him with the correctness of our view. But if others are to follow him, and that, too, among our own countrymen, and if they are to imitate the excellences of his style and learning, as they may, we hope they will be careful to avoid, as far as possible, the failing of which we speak.

But it is not the most grateful task to speak of failings, and we did not intend to do so at the beginning of our brief remarks upon the commentaries to which the volume now before us calls our thoughts. Their good points are so far more numerous than their defects, and the real value, which they have, has been so long appreciated by us in our daily use of them, that we can only express our acknowledgments to the author for the great service he has rendered in this department of study, and, at the same time, we are glad to renew our commendation of them to all our theological readers. Such commendation will not be needed in the case of the large numbers who have already used them.

It will be remembered what the design of the author is, as indicated by the title of all his separate volumes. As we speak of the

peculiarities or excellences of his works, therefore, to those who have not examined them, it will, of course, be borne in mind that they profess to be only what the author sets forth. They do not pretend to discourse upon the text, or to suggest practical reflections, either for the edification of the private Christian, or for the use of the writer of sermons, but only to give the thought and meaning of the Apostle in every verse. Within the limits of this design, they have many excellences. The author is exceedingly happy in the clear presentation of his own views, and also of the views of other writers. He has a most praiseworthy earnestness in ascertaining what is the exact shade of thought of the sacred writer, and an equal readiness to admit and accept what the rules of language, and the whole light which can be shed upon it, determine the thought to be. Like every true scholar, he acknowledges the good which he finds in the writings of others, from whatever quarter, upon the same subject, not shrinking in alarm from the continental commentators, or making the place of their residence, or the errors which may be found around them or among them, a sufficient reason for turning aside from them altogether. At the same time, he does not servilely follow them or any one else, but patiently and thoroughly investigates for himself, and defends his own conclusions by reasonable arguments. We think the reader, of whatever school or belief he may be, will accept the work of Ellicott as that of an earnest, candid, open-minded and warm-hearted man, who sincerely loves the truth, and is ready to follow it, whatever it may be, or whithersoever it may lead him. The author seems to have given himself, with much energy and enthusiasm, to the study of the early versions even from the time of the beginning of his plan; and in his later volumes, though it is with the modest admission of his small attainments even up to the present time, he speaks confidently of his progress under all the difficulties of the case. "Poor and insufficient as my contributions are," he adds, in the volume now before us, "I still deem it necessary to offer them, for I have been not a little startled to find that even *critical* editors, of the stamp of Tischendorf, have apparently not acquired even a rudimentary knowledge of several of the leading versions which they conspicuously quote." In this commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians, &c., he has referred to the Coptic and Ethiopic versions, as well as to others with which he had made comparison in earlier volumes. Upon the importance of the study of these ancient ver-

sions, he insists with much emphasis. To the examination of the Greek fathers he has likewise given himself, and he argues earnestly for the use of them by all interpreters. The tracing out and determination of the meaning of words, their usage by Paul and the other New Testament writers, &c., &c., are things which the author, of course, never loses sight of; while the exact representation of their meaning in our own language is made his great object. In both these points we think his readers will regard him as having been very successful, and very helpful to themselves. In this connection, we may refer to the Revised Translations at the end of each volume, which, while avoiding all necessary deviations from the authorized English version, give, in all cases where it seemed to be important for the sense, what the author regards as an improved rendering. All persons will agree that this portion of his work is equally well done with the others. Of his views of inspiration we have spoken briefly heretofore, and will only say that the strictest, in their opinions on this subject, will hardly fail to be satisfied; while, as to his devotional sentiments, they are but little pressed upon the reader's attention, and even those who differ with him will not value his works any the less on this account. A writer of the most evangelical character, and a most devout believer in Jesus Christ as the Eternal and Divine Son of God, and in all the truths which He revealed, he will, of course, meet no unfavorable or doubtful reception on the part of any to whom we address ourselves as our circle of readers and friends. And his manifest love of the truth and devotion to the cause of the common Master will,—even as these things show themselves on the pages of these volumes,—awaken an admiration and sympathy in the heart of every true Christian of every name.

The author has passed, since his first work was published in this country, from the position of Professor of Divinity in Kings College, London, to that of Lord Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol. He is well worthy of all the honors in his Church, which he may have received, and is certainly doing much to honor it and his native land, in a field where they have none too many who are able to do so. As he is yet under fifty years of age, we may look for a considerable period of active service for him in the future, and may expect, with confidence, still farther results of his learning.

We had intended to allude to his views upon one or two of the more important passages in the Epistles commented upon in this volume, but the proper examination of them would carry us be-

yond the limits allowed us in a short notice, while the mere presentation would scarcely be of much benefit to any one. We therefore leave our readers to look into the volume for themselves, and we are sure that all who do so, though they may see deficiencies here and there which we have not mentioned, will feel that they are using the work of a thorough yet unpretending scholar, who merits their praise as fully as he receives our own.

DR. SPRING'S REMINISCENCES.*—The idea of writing his Autobiography was first suggested to the venerable Dr. Spring by meeting with the remark of the Spanish commander, Spinola; who, on being told that Sir Francis De Vere died of having nothing to do, replied, "that was enough to *kill a General*." In retracing the course of his life, Dr. Spring has found genial occupation, since his retirement from active labor in the pastoral office. His father, Rev. Samuel Spring, D. D., of Newburyport, Mass., was a classmate of James Madison at Nassau Hall, where he was graduated in 1771. He respected the integrity of Madison, even after they were separated in political sentiment, and occasionally corresponded with him.

The senior Dr. Spring began the study of theology with Dr. Witherspoon at Princeton, and afterwards came under the instruction of the celebrated New England divines, Bellamy; West, of Stockbridge; and Hopkins. He accompanied, in the character of chaplain, the Revolutionary expedition to Quebec, under Arnold, and was with Aaron Burr when the latter attempted to rescue the body of Montgomery. In his theology, he was a Hopkinsian leader. He was a brother-in-law and an intimate friend of Dr. Emmons. He had a strong mind and a strong character. Dr. Spring gives a picture of his early home. A deep piety, not without a tincture of ungenial rigor, prevailed there. He says of his father:—"He would not shave his face on the Lord's day, nor allow my mother to sew a button on her son's vest; and on one occasion, when his nephew, the late Adolphus Spring, Esq., arrived in haste on a Saturday evening with a message that his father was on the bed of death, he would not mount his horse for the journey of seventy miles, until the Sabbath sun had gone

* *Personal Reminiscences of the Life and Times of Gardiner Spring, Pastor of the Brick Presbyterian Church, in the City of New York. Two vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$5.*

down." p. 28. He seems to have forgotten that the Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath. An interesting account is given of his conversation, on his death-bed, with Dr. Dana and Dr. Woods. One chapter of this work, Dr. Spring devotes to his mother. It is full of the tenderness of filial affection. In 1814 her son, Lewis, perished at sea; and she was wrung with grief on account of the absence of any evidence that he had been converted; but the mother's heart was somewhat comforted by the sudden recollection of the words of Scripture: "And in the fourth watch of the night, Jesus came to them, walking on the water." "I know," she says, "that Jesus was able to appear for him in his last moments. * * * Yet I know that my consolation must be drawn from a different source. *The Lord reigneth.*" Gardiner Spring finished his collegiate studies at Yale, in 1805. He says that he "was a severe student, and as ambitious as Julius Cæsar." In 1803, during a revival of religion in College, his feelings were strongly affected with religious truth. After graduating, he commenced the study of law in the office of Judge Daggett, and worked with his wonted zeal. His slender pecuniary resources led him to comply with an invitation to go to the island of Jamaica, as a classical and mathematical teacher. Once during his residence there he returned, and was married to Miss Susan Barney of New Haven, who accompanied him back to the island. Returning again to New Haven, with fifteen hundred dollars in his pocket, he resumed the study of law, was admitted to the bar in December, 1808, and opened his office. A renewal of powerful religious impressions, under the preaching of Rev. Moses Stuart, then Pastor of the First Church in New Haven, moved him to change his profession and become a minister of the Gospel. After studying for a while at Andover, he commenced to preach, was heard with favor, and at length was installed pastor of the "Brick Church," by the Presbytery of New York, on the 8th of August, 1810. For more than half a century he has upheld orthodox views of Christianity with unwavering firmness in a place of great conspicuousness and influence; and we coincide with those who have pronounced his ministry an honorable and useful one.

In the course of these volumes, the author has related anecdotes illustrative of his method of awakening and guiding souls. Simplicity, fidelity, and a certain inexorable tone—which may sometimes border on hardness—characterize this part of his teaching, if we may judge from the examples he has given us.

There is less of that instruction which tends to cultivate morbid introspection and self-brooding than we should expect, considering the metaphysics in which he was trained. In one case, there is a conversation with an inquirer, in which the Hopkinsian "submission to God" seems to take the place of the Gospel "belief in Christ;" but even here the pastor concludes by pointing his young parishioner to the Saviour. (Vol. II., p. 182).

Dr. Spring's Autobiography throws important light upon the origin of Andover Seminary. There has been a complaint against Professor Park, on the part of some, that he believes, with the Hopkinsians, that all sin consists in sinning. He has been attacked with acrimony for continuing to hold his place, while dissenting from some phrases of the Westminster Assembly's Catechism. It was known, however, that Dr. Woods, in his controversy with Dr. Ware of Cambridge, had declared his disagreement with expressions of the same creed; and it has been difficult for candid minds to see how that which was consistent with honesty in one man is justly called "perjury" in another. Dr. Woods committed the grave impropriety of altering, in his last edition, inconvenient passages in his controversial essays of an earlier date; but the truth could not be concealed. That Dr. Woods began at Andover as a Hopkinsian, and was chosen for the reason that he was a Hopkinsian, was a fact familiar to all who had taken pains to make the proper inquiry. Dr. Spring produces two letters of Dr. Woods to Dr. Samuel Spring, written in 1808, in which the former says:—"I know not that there is *any difference* between us as to the *matter of divine truth*, or the *principles of theology*." "I assure you, dear sir, I never felt more strongly attached to Hopkinsianism than now. I am more and more convinced that this system of religious sentiment and administration is the nearest of all existing systems to the apostolic standard." (Vol. I., pp. 310, 312). When Dr. Spring went to New York he was himself an adherent of this type of theology. Coming into the Presbyterian church and into a community where the Scottish Calvinism prevailed, he was exposed to suspicion, and had to justify himself before those who stood on the triangle of Imputation, Natural Inability, and Limited Atonement. He made all the concessions which honesty permitted, but never forsook, though in some respects he gradually modified, his New England doctrines. He discards the Hopkinsian theory that God is the author of sin, and the dogma of unconditional sub-

mission or "willingness to be damned for the divine glory." On the subject of Natural Ability, he expresses himself with caution and reserve, hardly coming up to the New England statement, yet strenuously maintaining the sinfulness of "unregenerate doings," or of all actions done prior to repentance. He manfully opposed the excising action by which the Presbyterian church was divided, but when his opposition had proved ineffectual, he remained with the Old School. He still recommends the reading of Emmons to theological students, notwithstanding the denunciation of that author by the Princeton reviewers.

We regret the necessity of speaking of any portion of this work in other terms than those of respect and approbation. But the author has introduced a chapter (Vol. II., Ch. II.) on "New Haven Theology," which is justly open to criticism. It is the habit of certain theological writers to make no mention of the late Dr. Taylor without coupling with his name epithets conveying reproach. One who knew nothing of him save what he could learn from the allusions of the *Princeton Review* would naturally conclude that, as a teacher of truth, he was no better than a Mormon or an Atheist. Yet, perhaps the gravest charge brought against him is that of a leaning towards that type of theology which was held, among others, by John Wesley. It is *not true* that Dr. Taylor was an Arminian, but the worst accusation brought against him is that of being one. Now, if he *were* an Arminian, is this a reason for the disrespect and reproach which a class of writers habitually manifest towards him? That he was an able, independent, sincere, earnest, large-hearted man,—a theologian who spent his life in the study and inculcation of religious truth,—a preacher useful beyond most of the preachers of his time in bringing sinners to repentance, all who know anything of him are bound to concede. Why then is he vilified? Why is he denounced as a heretic by some who speak of such men as Lyman Beecher with respect and praise, although Beecher was his bosom friend, fervently loved and trusted him, and essentially followed him in the peculiarities of his theological creed? We regret to notice the disparaging tone in which even Dr. Spring chooses to characterize the opinions and writings of one who does not stand second to him in intellectual vigor, piety, and usefulness as a preacher of the Gospel. "In the year 1829, a different turn was given to these discussions by the novel and unscriptural speculations of the Rev. Dr. Nathaniel W. Taylor, D. D., (*sic*), who occupied the chair of theology in Yale College."

"The novel and unscriptural speculations,"—here are three terms of reproach brought together. Well, is it a sin to be the author of "speculations?" If so, what judgment shall be pronounced on Edwards, the elder and younger, on Emmons, whom Dr. Spring holds in high esteem, and on the rest of the leaders of New England theology? Is it a sin to be the author of "*novel* speculations?" What then shall be said of the Hopkinsian peculiarities? Are not the doctrines of "unconditional submission," and the divine authorship of sin, and the wickedness of the prayers of the unregenerate, "*novel speculations*?" And as to the "unscriptural"—all speculations are in one sense unscriptural, since the Scriptures do not speculate; and if it be meant that Dr. Taylor's opinions were opposed to the teaching of the Bible, this is a point which the *ipse dixit* of Dr. Spring does not settle. We are not set for the defense of Dr. Taylor's system. We thankfully receive whatever is conformed, in our judgment, to Scripture and reason; and what seems to us to be not thus justified we reject. In New England it is not yet thought necessary either to blindly follow a man, or else blindly denounce him. Important questions in theology and in practical religion Dr. Taylor handled with masterly ability; and the effect of his teaching is seen in half the pulpits of the land, even among those whose opinions and mode of preaching have been affected by his influence unconsciously to themselves. There were other questions, in the treatment of which we think him to have been much less happy. He made the mistake of supposing that by dint of argument he could make men understand and appreciate his philosophical views, who were as inaccessible to metaphysical definition and reasoning as a stone post. Hence his reputation suffered through the misapprehensions and misrepresentations of itinerant preachers and others, who failed to see the real sense and intent of his discussions. He treated his opponents with a courtesy that frequently had a poor return.

Dr. Spring dwells upon Dr. Taylor's reviews of his essay on the Means of Regeneration, which were published in four consecutive numbers of the "*Quarterly Christian Spectator*." The Hopkinsians explained conversion by their theory of divine efficiency. There was no way for holy "*exercises*" to take the place of sinful, except by a miraculous creation. Regeneration was thus made not only supernatural but magical. It was no part of Dr. Taylor's design in these Articles to take away or diminish the agency of the Holy Spirit in regeneration. His aim was simply to set

forth the psychology of conversion, the inward process through which the soul passes in the act of turning to God ; and of showing that this change, though supernaturally effected, takes place in accordance with the laws of mind. He wished also to show how it is consistent to call upon men to act, at the same time that their conversion is not to be hoped for without the divine operation. Whether his psychological exposition was altogether correct—whether, for example, the “self-love theory” is well founded or not—is not now the question. New England theology, especially under Hopkinsian influence, was in a deplorable state on this great topic,—maintaining the natural ability of the sinner to love God and believe in the Gospel, but unable to give any rational account of the process of this possible change. Dr. Taylor set out to analyze this inward conversion, which, in common with all the New England theologians, he held that man is naturally able, but morally unable to effect. These four dissertations are among the ablest productions of the New England school of theologians. It is a shame that their true character and relation to the existing theology have been so frequently misunderstood.

The reception at New Haven of Dr. Spring's views in regard to native depravity, he makes another subject of complaint. He had some doubt about the propriety of preaching his dissertation on this theme in the College Chapel. “Whether wisely or unwisely,” he says, “meekly or impudently, I did preach it in the chapel of Yale College, in the presence of President Day, and the professors and students.” “It created no small stir. One of the professors in the medical department manifested his displeasure by abruptly and demonstratively leaving the chapel in the midst of the discourse. The dissertation was printed in New York in the year 1833. It was reviewed by the Rev. Professor Goodrich and others, in the fifth volume of the *Christian Spectator*, with needless severity, and little argument.” Any of our readers who happen to have the fifth volume of the “*Spectator*” will gain a better idea of the character of Professor Goodrich's Article from perusing it, than from Dr. Spring's comment upon it. But what was Dr. Spring's doctrine, to doubt respecting which was a sign of heresy ? It was not the Augustinian doctrine, the old doctrine of theology, that in every child of Adam there is from the beginning a latent principle of character which will unfold itself in sinful action when intelligence is sufficiently developed to render responsible action possible. This doctrine he, in common with the New

Haven divines, rejected,—whether wisely or not, we will not here consider. Nor did he agree with the Old Schoolism of New England, with Woods and Tyler, that there is a “property” of the soul which is sinful. But Dr. Spring’s doctrine was, to use the language of the “Spectator,” “that every infant is a moral and accountable being, under a law which he knowingly and voluntarily transgresses at the very instant of his creation.” In this proposition, he not only differs from Augustine, Calvin, Edwards, and orthodox theology generally, but he even went beyond Hopkins and Emmons, who did not express themselves on this point without doubt and qualification. Hopkins had said:—“As soon as they [infants] begin to act they sin, and though it cannot be precisely determined how soon this is,” &c. Emmons had said:—“It is certainly supposable that children may exist in this world some space of time before they become moral agents, but how long that space may be, we do not presume to determine.” Dr. Dwight had said that “a great part of mankind die in infancy before they are or can be capable of moral action, in the usual meaning of that phrase.” Dr. Taylor and Professor Goodrich held the opinion which is expressed by Hopkins. They held that all mankind begin to sin as soon as they are capable of putting forth moral preferences; and because they would not fix this date at the moment of the infant’s creation, Dr. Spring thought himself authorized to charge them with broaching “novel speculations,” with teaching Pelagianism, and with like offenses! The “Spectator” showed conclusively that the “novel speculation” was on the side of Dr. Spring himself. A word as to the delivery of Dr. Spring’s discourse in the Chapel of Yale College, and the exit of one of his auditors. As Dr. Spring was dilating on his theme, and explaining that the mother who clasps her babe to her bosom is little conscious that she is hugging a viper, Dr. Nathan Smith, Professor in the Medical College, a physician of high reputation and a man of sturdy sense, taking a little grandchild with each hand, “abruptly and demonstratively,” as Dr. Spring correctly states, marched out of the Chapel. Now, we cannot say that if we heard such notions propounded, we should walk *out* of church, but if we knew beforehand that they *were* to be propounded, we should take care not to walk *in*. We have just at this point a question or two to propose. Who now preaches Dr. Spring’s doctrine of *actual* sin coeval with birth? Did Dr. Shedd, who lately ministered in Dr. Spring’s pulpit with so much power?

Does the able and excellent gentleman, who is at present associated with Dr. Spring, attempt to edify his hearers by long sermons on the particular form of the doctrine of infant depravity which Dr. Spring thought it expedient to recommend to the students of Yale College? Where is his doctrine heard in these days? We very much fear that the "novel speculations" of New Haven theology, or some other influence equally potent, have modified the taste of the religious public; and that the actual sins of new-born infants escape with little rebuke from the most orthodox preaching of the present day. The simple truth is that what Dr. Spring brought into the Yale Chapel was not a doctrine of the orthodox creed, but an offshoot of Hopkinsian divinity,—a provincialism which has had no acceptance outside of a small coterie of theologians. The New England divines had long before abandoned the dogma of the imputation of Adam's sin, whether in the form of real participation, as held by President Edwards, or of putative, constructive participation, as held now at Princeton. The foundations of the doctrine of strictly innate, or connate sin, were thus taken away. The Hopkinsians clung to the doctrine, however, and, in maintaining it, sometimes set up the novel and untenable theory of *actual* sin—of sinful volitions—contemporaneous with birth. On the premises of the New England theology, Dr. Taylor and his associates were much more rational and consistent. They held that sin begins in the individual with the beginning of intelligent, voluntarily agency; but they declined to commit themselves to the support of the proposition that such agency belongs to the new-born infant. This last doctrine and its corollaries were not found to be agreeable to the common sense of Christian men. Dr. Spring ought to be grateful that when he propounded these obnoxious tenets at New Haven, not more than *one* of his hearers walked out of meeting.

We renew the expression of our regret that anything in these volumes should call for unfavorable criticism. But it is high time that the disrespectful manner in which Dr. Taylor is habitually treated by a class of writers who lay claim to superlative orthodoxy should be condemned as it deserves; and we do not intend to let this class of critics prosecute their business any longer with impunity.

BISHOP HORATIO POTTER AND HIS RESPONDENTS.*—This is another phase in the old dispute of High Church and Low Church. Bishop Potter prints a letter to the Episcopalian clergy in his diocese, "touching the law of the Church," which he judges to have been violated by certain individuals in two particulars. In the first place, Episcopal ministers have allowed non-Episcopal divines to preach in their houses of worship; and, in the second place, Episcopal ministers have themselves preached on particular occasions without reading the liturgy beforehand. Dr. Budington had been invited to preach, and had actually preached on a Sunday evening in Dr. Canfield's church. Dr. William Adams had done the same thing for Dr. John Cotton Smith, and Drs. Muhlenberg and Dyer, by the request of Dr. Adams, had read the service on the occasion. The Bishop gives no names, but it is well understood that he had reference to these occurrences. Dr. Tyng, and perhaps some other prominent clergymen, who had been implicated in similar transactions, also felt themselves censured by the Pastoral. This document is on the surface quite smooth and courteous. Bishop Potter professes to write with great reluctance and from a profound sense of duty to "the Church." Yet he throws out the remark that some of the offenders "may have acted hastily," which in the case of veterans like Drs. Tyng and Muhlenberg is hardly probable. He alludes to the same offenders also as persons who please themselves "with beautiful visions of fraternal union," rush out of their "legitimate sphere, and violate the laws of that sphere;" and adverts to the solemnity of their ordination vows, enforcing his observations by a liberal use of italics and capitals. Yet, in the main, the style of the circular is as decorous and affectionate as it could be, considering the doctrine which he set out to inculcate. The Bishop's own position was somewhat embarrassed by once or twice having himself authorized Dr. Muhlenberg to invite Dr. Schaff, a minister of the German Reformed Church, and of course without Episcopal ordination, to preach for him. He expresses regret, however, for having done so, and promises never to be guilty again of a like impropriety. He had, moreover, allowed a vagabond Greek priest to celebrate

* *Pastoral Letter of the Rt. Rev. H. Potter, D. D., D. O. L., with the Replies of the Rev. S. H. TYNG, D. D., Rev. E. H. CANFIELD, D. D., Rev. JOHN COTTON SMITH, D. D., and Rev. W. A. MUHLENBERG, D. D.* New York: John A Gray & Green, Printers. 1865.

Mass in an Episcopal edifice ; but for this, as Father Agapius was ordained by a Bishop, he has no regret. He plants himself on several canons, the most essential passages of which, as far as his reasoning is concerned, are the following :—"No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal consecration or ordination." "No person shall be permitted to officiate in any congregation of this Church, without his first providing the evidence of his being a minister thereof," &c. "Every minister shall, before all sermons and lectures, and on all other occasions of public worship, use the Book of Common Prayer, * * * and in performing such service, no other prayers shall be read than those prescribed by the said book."

The first—taking the Respondents in the order in which they stand in the pamphlet before us—to open his batteries on the Bishop's admonitory epistle, is Dr. Tyng. He begins by saying, that as the canons only authorize the Bishop to deliver *charges* to his clergy, and send pastoral letters to his people, and as Bishop Potter's letter is neither the one or the other, it can only have the force of a personal communication. The main facts on which the Bishop animadverts in his reproof, are "the use of extemporaneous prayer, and the union with other denominations of Christians in religious worship." Dr. Tyng plainly implies that the Bishop has played into the hands of a High Church faction, and turned against his friends, to whom he owes his election to office. He characterizes the letter as follows :

"It opposes with admonitions, perhaps with threats, of needless severity, a general tendency and spirit of our time, which is not only in itself harmless and entirely tolerable, but is, in its purpose and desire, manifestly in the line of divine truth and example, adapted to edify rather than to destroy the best interests of the Gospel and the Church of God. It throws your influence and yourself on the side of an exclusiveness of partisan judgment and action, which I am sure is not the spirit of the New Testament ; which can never be acceptable or welcomed in the Christianity of our land ; and which, in its relations to our own Church, can only tend, as it has always tended, to retard its growth, to limit its influence, to discredit its character, and make it unpopular and repulsive in the apprehension of the people whom it seeks to gather and to bless." pp. 4, 5.

Dr. Tyng refuses to govern his conduct by the doctrines of the letter. First, he takes up the history of the claims which are press-

ed in this document. He shows that the High Church scheme propounded by Bishop Potter, was not recognized by previous Bishops—White, Madison, Bass, Provost, or Moore, but began with Hobart; that Bishop Griswold and Bishop Moore, of Virginia, contemporaries of Hobart, were opponents of that scheme; that Hobart himself never ventured “to carry out the practical logic of his principles.” Secondly, he refers to circumstances in his own personal history. In the diocese of Massachusetts, under Bishop Griswold, in the diocese of Pennsylvania, under Bishops White and Henry Onderdonk, in the diocese of New York, under Wainwright, he had enjoyed full liberty to engage in occasional acts of fellowship with other religious denominations. In Maryland alone, under a Bishop of the Hobart stamp, an unsuccessful effort had been made to abridge this freedom. “I am compelled,” he says, “to look back upon my whole career and say, Neither the spotless Griswold, nor the patriarchal White, nor the intelligent and logical Onderdonk, nor the generous and open-hearted Wainwright, ever denounced or reproved me; but justified and encouraged me with paternal and brotherly support. If I have been wrong in my principles or conduct, they were eminently so. If they have been just, and been justified, then have the principles of my ministry been canonical and correct; and I have ‘ministered the discipline of Christ as this Church hath received the same.’ You leave me no other resource in earthly determination, than to throw myself back upon this whole complete career of ministry, and to avow its rectitude, in the theories of its guidance, and in the facts which have distinguished it; and to commit myself for the future to my Master and His Church, while I say, humbly but solemnly, I can do no otherwise in time to come.” pp. 14, 15.

Dr. Tyng then proceeds to examine and confute Bishop Potter's strict construction of the laws of his Church. We quote:

“This High Church interpretation of doctrine, sacraments, and discipline, this Church had never received; neither had the Lord commanded it, in any information then given to me, nor in any further information which I have since been able to acquire. I regard it as a new doctrine, ‘unawares brought in, to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, and to bring us again into bondage,’ to which I must say: We can ‘give place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel may continue’ in the Church.

“This new scheme of excluding and unchurching all ‘non-Episcopal divines,’ ‘excluding ministers and licentiates of non-Episcopal bodies, not only from administering the sacraments, but also from teaching within her fold, holding them to be incompetent,’ I do not believe ‘the Lord hath commanded,’ or that it is ‘ac-

ording to the commandment of God;' and I certainly know that 'this Church hath not received the same,' but has rejected it, and resisted it, and renounced it, always, on every occasion on which individual persons in the church have attempted to enforce it, or assume it, as the doctrine and teaching of the Church.

"The English Church at the Reformation certainly did not receive it. The divines of the Continental Reformation were freely acknowledged, consulted, referred to, and invited to teach and minister in her universities, and among her people. Neither Cranmer, nor Parker, nor Whitgift, her first eminent and her abiding authoritative leaders, taught the excluding principles of this scheme. Bancroft was, perhaps, its originator in the English Church. At least, I have not been able to find a trace of it in the authorities of the English Church before him.

"The Church of England did not receive this interpretation, when she sent Hall, and Davenant, and Carleton, to take counsel with the Synod of Dort, an assembly of Presbyterian divines, on terms of perfect equality and unrestricted freedom.

"The English Church did not receive this scheme, when the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, the very Society which has been always counted the pattern and model of orthodoxy in the Church, commissioned Lutheran ministers, without Episcopal ordination, as competent to be the missionaries and representatives of this Church, in the introduction of the Gospel into India.

"The English Church did not receive this scheme when, subsequently, the Church Missionary Society employed similar ministers and missionaries to propagate the Gospel in Africa and the East.

"The English Church has never received this scheme, from the Reformation down to this day. Its introduction has always been opposed and contended with, as a novelty which the Church had never received. The character of the Archbishops of Canterbury in the whole line of their testimony from the Reformation, has been the solemn witness and token of the opposite decision. From Cranmer down to Sumner, they have transmitted no such scheme to their successors. The only conspicuous name among them adopting the scheme is the ill-fated Laud. While all whose names have given honor to their station, like those whom I have mentioned, and Wake, and Moore, and Tenison, and Tillotson, and Secker, and others like them, have presented no such doctrine as the doctrine of the Church over which they so honorably presided.

"The American Church did not receive this interpretation in her settlement of doctrine. Her opposing stand is as notorious as any fact in past human history. In the preface to her Prayer-Book, the key to its interpretation, she says: 'This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England, on any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship, or further than local circumstances require.' Her first generation of Bishops did not adopt it, nor transmit it. The great body of her ministers and people never have adopted it. The Church in the Eastern Diocese, comprising the five New England States, in which I was ordained, had never received it. It was never, as a scheme of doctrine, delivered to me. I have not received it in the Church or from the Church. I have always considered it as among the 'erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word,' which I promised, 'the Lord being my helper,' 'with all

faithful diligence, to banish and drive away from the Church.' And I have always endeavored, in fulfillment of my promise, with 'faithful diligence always to minister the doctrines and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Church hath received the same,' but not as Archbishops Bancroft, or Laud, or Bishop Hobart, have assumed to be its infallible interpreters."

These facts are highly important, and deserve to be universally understood. The bigotry that unchurches all other religious denominations, and prates about the "sects," is a novelty and innovation unknown to the great Anglican Reformers, and dating from the worst days of English tyranny when the Stuarts were trying to trample down all liberty. "Antiquity," the great idol of the High Church party, is just what their boastful pretensions lack. As to the meaning of the canons, Dr. Tyng asserts that the "occasional ministering, or speaking or preaching," in Episcopal churches is not "officiating," within the meaning of the law; and he makes good his interpretation by an appeal to usage. Even laymen have been invited to speak in their churches by bishops, and have been authorized to read the whole liturgy. The canon was originally designed to guard against impostors. It is afterwards, in this pamphlet, shown that the canon, which Bishop Potter cites, equally forbids the "officiating" of episcopally ordained ministers not belonging to the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. As concerns the use of the Prayer-Book, Dr. Tyng thus replies to the solemn observations of the Bishop:

"I doubt if there be a single minister of the Church who has ever carried out this literal application of the canon, according to its strict interpretation.

"Who is there that has never read anything but the regular morning and evening prayer before sermons or lectures? Who is there that has not introduced, and seen others introduce, missionary meetings and other occasions of benevolent associations, when there were many lectures, by a few collects, variously selected and put together, instead of insisting on the whole morning or evening prayer? Who is there in the ministry that ever pretended to carry out an obedience to all the rubrics of the Prayer-Book? What man, Bishop or Presbyter, has obeyed the first rubric in the office for the ministration of Private Baptism, 'The minister of every parish shall often admonish the people that they defer not the baptism of their children longer than the first or second Sunday next after their birth?' Who is there that performs the office of Churching of Women, or obeys the rubric before that office?

"Bishops, who have no more authority in such cases than any others, have always followed in the same course, because the course is inevitable. Bishop Hobart's private prayers for funerals, for visitation of the sick and the afflicted, which are without the slightest claim to authority, and as really violations to the canons of the Church, (of which you say 'the Church leaves nothing to the fancy

or caprice of the officiating minister, will not allow her children to be disturbed in their solemn acts of worship by the intrusion of novel forms and expressions'), as any extemporaneous prayer which may be offered, are in the habitual use perhaps of half the clergy in your diocese, and they not the half to whom your present rebukes apply." pp. 20, 21.

Dr. Canfield, in his letter to the Bishop, calls attention to the circumstance that the latter habitually speaks of "*the Church*," although the language of the canons and the Prayer-Book is "*this Church*," or "*our Church*." The difference is not without significance. The Fathers of the English Episcopal church did not pretend that this body was "*the Church*." This offensive phraseology is characteristic of more modern bigotry. As if the religious body in which Dr. Potter is a clergyman were alone, in this country, entitled to the name of *Church*! Dr. Canfield's rejoinder to the Bishop's rigid construction of the canons is even more pointed and successful than Dr. Tyng's. The following remarks are valuable:—

"It is manifest to every reader of the Letter, that the *gravamen* of the offenses complained of, consists in certain *acts* of ministers of our Church, from which the public might *infer* that the actor recognized the validity of non-Episcopal orders. This is obviously the head and heart of the offense. It stands out boldly in all the document. This constitutes the only essential difference between the use of Trinity Chapel, by a supposed minister of the Russo-Greek Church, of which the Letter approves, and of the Ascension Church by a Presbyterian, which you condemn. (The Canon no more authorizes the presence of a minister from the English Church than it does from the Baptist or Presbyterian Churches. It makes no reference to his Episcopal or his non-Episcopal ordination). The Pastoral Letter is evidently based upon the theory, that the Canons were *expressly designed* to deny the validity of non-Episcopal orders, and to forbid any public acts which might appear to sanction such a doctrine. I do not question your right to draw this conclusion from them, and to hold it as a matter of private opinion, but I do respectfully *protest* against your attempt to enforce your inferences, in an arbitrary way, as the law of our Church. You must know that this was not the doctrine of the Reformers and Fathers of the Church of England, who framed the Articles and arranged the Prayer-Book; and that the founders of our Church in this country were 'far from intending to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship.'

"No historical fact is more 'evident' than that the Thirty-nine Articles, which are expressed in carefully selected, technical phraseology, to set forth her doctrine and principles, not only avoid taking this position, but that, in defining the visible Church, and declaring what is necessary to constitute ministerial authority, language is employed which was *purposely designed* to recognize the validity of the orders of the non-Episcopal Churches of Scotland and of the continent of Europe. Every well-informed person knows that as a consequent and consist-

ent fact, for the first hundred years after the Reformation, those having only Presbyterian orders were admitted without reordination to livings and benefices in the Church and Universities of England. It is equally as well known, that when the Laudean party, under Charles II., asked for a change in this particular, the legislation which granted the request was based upon other grounds than the irregularity or invalidity of non-Episcopal orders. You must know as well as I, that most of the leading divines of the Church of England, from the time of Henry VIII. to that of Victoria I., and, I may add, of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, from Bishop White to the present day, in the language of the late Professor Turner, 'never admitted the conclusion that those who abandoned Episcopacy thereby unchurched themselves.' I have always held, and still believe, not only that their views are *true*, but they are demonstrably the doctrine of our Church; that those who hold opposite views are permitted to do so in a spirit of large toleration, and that our rubrics and canons are to be so interpreted as to *harmonize* with, and not violate these principles, 'which are generally deemed sacred.' For twenty-one years I have steadfastly maintained them from the pulpit; I expect to do so while I am permitted to preach." pp. 5, 6.

In his more elaborate "Review" of Bishop Potter's Letter, Dr. Canfield reiterates the proposition quoted above. On the High Church perversion of titles and terms, he thus remarks:—

"It pervades the literature of this school. The Prayer-Book calls them *churches*, they say *dissenters* or the *sects*, or 'non-Episcopal bodies'; the Prayer-Book says *table*, they say *altar*; the Prayer-Book says *this Church*, they say *the Church*; the law says 'the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New York'; our Diocesan writes 'Bishop of New York.' Words are things. They are used in the Pastoral Letter with discrimination and care. I have not given undue importance to that which might appear, to a superficial observer, a trifling matter. These 'non-Episcopal bodies' may hold the faith in every essential point of doctrine; the graces and fruits of the Spirit may be clearly and powerfully illustrated in the lives of their members; their ministry may be eminent for its holiness, and its success in the conversion of sinners, and in the edification of the Christian; they may preach 'the pure word of God' and minister 'the sacraments according to Christ's ordinance in all those things which of necessity are requisite to the same,' but, because they lack a certain ecclesiastical pedigree, of which our own standards say nothing—a pedigree running through all the darkness, corruptions, and idolatries of the middle ages, through the convulsions and decay of the Roman Empire, back to the Apostles—they are not entitled to be called a Church, they have no claim to the promises of the Gospel and no interest in the covenant of grace.

"On the other hand, an 'episcopal body' may 'err in their living, manner of ceremonies, and in matters of faith; vainly invent doctrines repugnant to the Word of God,' introduce 'idolatries, superstitions, blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits,' and yet find a full atonement for all, in the fact that its ministry is, or claims to be, in a certain line of outward succession. Its covenant with life and peace is unbroken, because, forsooth, paganized priests who teach these heresies, and outrage the adorable Trinity by their idolatries, their monstrous usur-

pations of Divine prerogatives, and their prohibited oblations, claim to be lineally descended from the Apostles. This is the logic of the Pastoral Letter. It is painful and to me a sore humiliation to find the chosen head of our Church, whom I have always respected and loved, not only identifying himself with the views of such a party, but seeking to force their apparent endorsement upon all his clergy." p. 8.

We have room for only a portion of his remarks on the former liberality that characterized the English Episcopal Church. From Bishop Burnet he cites the annexed passage:—

"If a company of Christians find the public worship where they live to be so defiled that they cannot, with a good conscience, join in it, and if they do not know of any place to which they can conveniently go, where they may worship God purely and in a regular way—if, I say, such a body, finding some that have been ordained, though to the lower functions, should submit itself entirely to their conduct, or finding none of those, should by a common consent desire some of their own number to minister to them in holy things, and should from that beginning grow up to a regulated constitution, . . . when this grows to a constitution, and when it was begun by the consent of a body, who are supposed to have an authority in such an extraordinary case, *whatever some hotter spirits have thought of this since that time, yet we are very sure, that not only those who penned the Articles, but the body of this Church for above half an age after, did, notwithstanding those irregularities, acknowledge the foreign churches, so constituted, to be true churches as to all the essentials of a church, though they had been at first irregularly formed, and continued still to be in an imperfect state. And therefore the general words in which this part of the Article is framed, seemed to have been designed on purpose not to exclude them.*" (Burnet's *Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, 5th ed. 1746). p. 15.

Dr. Canfield then proceeds to convict the exclusive party of being the real innovators:—

"In strict accordance with these views, the validity of these non-Episcopal orders was recognized in the Church of England for upward of one hundred years, by allowing those thus ordained to hold livings, to preach, and to administer the sacraments in that Church. Strype, referring to an act passed in the thirteenth year of Elizabeth, 1571, says: 'By this, the ordinations of the foreign reformed churches were made valid, and those who had no other orders were made of the same capacity with others to enjoy any place in the ministry, within England, merely on their subscribing the Articles.' Bishop Oosin in his letter to Cordel, writes: 'If at any time a minister, so ordained in these French churches, came to incorporate himself in ours, and to receive a public charge or cure of souls among us, in the Church of England, (as I have known some of them to do of late, and can instance in many others before my time), our bishops did not re-ordain him before they admitted him to his charge; as they must have done if his former ordination in France had been void. Nor did our laws require more of him than to declare his public consent to the religion received among us, and to subscribe the Articles established.'

"Bishop Burnet writes: 'No bishop in Scotland did so much as desire any of

the Presbyterians to be reordained.' Not a single Archbishop, from Cranmer to the present day, except Laud, and perhaps Potter, has held this exclusive theory; and the same is demonstrable of the leading divines both of England and this country. The testimony of Cranmer, Parker, Grindal, Jewel, Whittingham, Andrews, Whitgift, Field, Hooker, Bramhall, Danevant, Hall, Usher, Tillotson, Wake, Secker, and a host of others on both sides of the Atlantic, might be adduced to confirm this statement." pp. 15, 16.

Dr. Canfield presents a good illustration of his interpretation of the law of his church:—

"Suppose we were to find prefixed to the ceremony prescribed for the coronation of the monarch of a particular kingdom, the following statement: It is evident unto all men diligently reading ancient authors and modern history, that from the days of Solomon there have been kings, who have ruled among the nations of the earth; which royal office has evermore been held in such reverend estimation, that no man might presume to execute the same unless he were approved and admitted thereunto by lawful authority. And therefore, to the intent that this office may be continued and reverently used and esteemed in *this realm* no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful king in *this nation*, or suffered to execute any of the functions of royalty in *this kingdom*, except he first be duly crowned according to the ceremony following, or has been duly crowned king in some other monarchy.

"I am ashamed to ask the question, whether any man of common sense would regard this as affirming that there can be no lawful government except a monarchy! whether it forbids its king and subjects to recognize nations otherwise governed as established states, and requires them to regard their officers as pretenders and usurpers?" p. 17.

The entire reply of Dr. Canfield is worthy of a careful perusal.

Dr. John Cotton Smith has no regrets to offer for the invitation extended to Dr. William Adams and for the service in which this gentleman preached. He says:—

"I have no apology to make for this service, and shall resort to no mere technicalities in its defense, but shall rest it upon what I hold to be, in the light of history and common sense, a fair and candid interpretation of the law and standards of our Church."

"So far from sympathizing with denominationalism and the sect-spirit among Christians, I have always contended against them, and striven especially that our Church should not descend from her catholic position to that of a denomination or sect. But for the very reason that I do hold this, I would take exactly the stand which, in my opinion, our Church has taken, recognizing the present abnormal state of Christendom, admitting that the various evangelical denominations have the essential characteristics of the Church and the ministry, and thus disarm them of those prejudices which arise from the exclusive theory and position." p. 5.

Dr. Smith also explains that it is a law of the state in England, and not the preface to the Ordinal, which prevents the dissenting

clergy from officiating in the Church of England. "It is simply a question between the establishment and dissent, and nothing could be more absurd for us, in this country, than to imitate the exclusiveness which grows out of the civil relations of the Church of England." The Erastianism more or less prevalent in the established Church of England has produced there a feeling against dissent which causes a great difference to be made between non-Episcopal Churches at home and non-Episcopal Churches abroad. That the recognition of non-Episcopal orders is warranted by the ancient practice of the Church of England in the age following the Reformation, and by the authority of her greatest divines, Dr. Smith abundantly proves. The point is one of so much importance and the facts are so often ignored or denied by ill-informed or dishonest partisans of the High Church theory, that we shall cite from Dr. Smith's array of the evidence a somewhat extended passage. The reader who is interested in the question will welcome this ample proof of the liberality that once prevailed in the Anglican Church.

"So far is such a recognition from being inconsistent with the spirit and history of our Church, that we find it constantly in the works of most of those venerable men who have been the glory of the Church of England. Mr. Keble himself admits, in his preface to Hooker, speaking of Jewel, Whitgift, Cooper, and others, (and the list might be indefinitely extended), that 'It is enough with them to show, that the government by archbishops and bishops is ancient and allowable; they never venture to urge its exclusive claim, or to connect the succession with the validity of the holy sacraments.' I do not refer to these opinions of our divines as approving them in all cases. Some of them take far too low views of episcopacy. I refer to them only to show that the recognition of the validity of non-episcopal orders has ever been held, to say the least, to be within the circle of lawful opinions in the Church.*

"In the 'Institution of a Christian Man,' issued by the bishops and clergy in 1587, we find this language: 'The truth is, that in the New Testament there is no mention of any degrees or distinctions in orders, but only of deacons or ministers, and of priests or bishops.'

"The views of Cranmer, on this subject, are so well known that any quotation from his works is unnecessary. In 1563 Dr. Pilkington, Bishop of Durham, says: 'The privileges and superiorities which bishops have above other ministers, are rather granted by men for maintaining of better order and quietness in commonwealths, than commanded by God in His Word.' † Archbishop Whitgift says: 'That any one kind of government is so necessary that without it the Church can-

* For most of the quotations which follow I am indebted to Mr. Wm. Goode's work—*Vindication of the Doctrines of the Church of England on the Validity of the Orders of the Scotch and Foreign Non-Episcopal Churches*.

† Confut. of an Addition. *Works*, ed. Parker Soc. p. 493.

not be saved, or that it may not be altered into some other kind, thought to be more expedient, I utterly deny; and the reasons that move me so to do be these. The first is because I find no one certain and perfect kind of government prescribed or commanded in the Scriptures to the Church of Christ. Secondly, because the essential notes of the Church be these only,—the true preaching of the Word of God, and the right administration of the sacraments.* Hooker says: 'There may be sometimes very just and sufficient reason to allow ordination made without a bishop.'† Saravia says: 'This also is true, that in such a state of confusion in the Church, when all the bishops fall away from the true worship of God into idolatry, without any violation of the government of the Church, the whole authority of the episcopal government is devolved upon the pious and orthodox presbyters, so that a presbyter clearly may ordain presbyters.'‡ Lord Bacon, though a layman, is an important witness to the prevalent opinion in his time. He says: 'Some indiscreet persons have been bold in open preaching to use dishonorable and derogatory speech and censure of the Churches abroad: and that so far as some of our men, as I have heard, ordained in foreign parts, have been pronounced to be no lawful ministers.'§ Bishop Andrews says: 'Though our government be of Divine right, it follows not either that there is no salvation, or that a Church cannot stand without it. He must needs be stone-blind that sees not Churches standing without it.'|| Archbishop Bramhall says: 'Many Protestant Churches lived under kings and bishops of another communion; others had particular reasons why they could not continue or introduce bishops.' 'I know that there is great difference between a VALID and a REGULAR ordination.'¶ Archbishop Bancroft, when it was proposed that certain candidates for the Scotch Episcopate should first be ordained presbyters, as not having been ordained by a bishop, replied: 'That thereof there was no necessity, seeing where bishops could not be had, the ordination given by presbyters must be esteemed lawful.'** Archbishop Usher says: 'I do protest that with like affection I should receive the blessed sacrament at the hands of the Dutch ministers, if I were in Holland, as I should at the hands of the French ministers, if I were in Charentone.'†† Bishop Hall says: 'Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation.' 'The only difference is in the form of outward administration, wherein also we are so far agreed, as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church.'‡‡ Bishop Morton says: 'Where the bishops degenerate into wolves, there the presbyters regain their ancient right of ordaining.'§§ Dean Field says:

* *Def. of Ans. to Adm.* 1574, p. 81.

† *Ecol. Pol.* vii. 14.

‡ *Defens. Tract de div. Ministr. Ev. gradibus, &c.*, ch. ii. p. 32. from the Latin.

§ *Works*, by Basil Montagu. London, 1827. Vol. VII. p. 48.

|| *Wordsw. Christ. Instit.* Vol. III. p. 239.

¶ *Works of*, ed. Vol. III. pp. 475, 476.

** Spotsiswood's *Hist. Church and State of Scotland*, 4th ed., 1677, folio, p. 514.

†† *Judg. of Archbishop of Armagh, &c.*, London, 1657, p. 127.

‡‡ *The Peacemaker*, § 6, 1647. *Works*, by Pratt, Vol. VIII. p. 56.

§§ *Apol. Cathol.* pt. 1, lib. 1, c. 21, 2d ed., London, 1606, 8vo. p. 74.

'And who knoweth not, that all presbyters in cases of necessity, may absolve and reconcile penitents, a thing in ordinary course appropriated unto bishops! And why not, by the same reason, ordain presbyters and deacons in cases of like necessity!*' Dean Cosin says: 'I do not see but that both you and others that are with you may (either in case of necessity, when you cannot have the sacrament among yourselves, or in regard of declaring your unity in professing the same religion, which you and they do) go otherwhiles to communicate reverently with them of the French Church.'† Bishop Stillingfleet, in *Irenicum*, maintains that the stoutest champions for Episcopacy had admitted that ordination by presbyters in case of necessity is valid. Dean Sherlock says: 'I do not make Episcopacy so absolutely necessary to Catholic communion as to unchurch all Churches which have it not.‡ Archbishop Sancroft exhorts his clergy to 'warmly and affectionately exhort them (the Protestant Dissenters) to join with us in daily fervent prayer to the God of peace for the universal blessed union of all Reformed Churches both at home and abroad, against our common enemies.'§ Archbishop Wake says: '*Ecclesias Reformatas etai in aliquibus a nostra Anglicana dissentientes, libenter amplector.*'|| Archbishop Secker says: 'Our inclination is to live in friendship with all the Protestant Churches. . . . We show our regard to that of Scotland as often as we have an opportunity.'¶ Bishop Tomline says: 'I readily acknowledge that there is no precept in the New Testament which commands that every Church should be governed by bishops.**' Archbishop Howley speaks of the foreign Reformed Churches as 'the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant Churches of Europe.'†† Archbishop Sumner, as is well known from the recent controversies on the subject, declared his belief in the validity of non-episcopal ordination. Besides this, to say nothing of the practice of the Church Missionary Society, the whole bench of bishops has had for more than a century the direction of the Venerable Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and with its sanction this society has constantly sent forth to preach the Word and administer the sacraments, those who have had only non-episcopal ordination.

"So far also were the Reformers and divines of our Church from holding that non-episcopal divines were 'incompetent to teach' our people, that Cranmer invited Martyr and Bucer to the universities of Oxford and Cambridge, to train up the clergy; and the Convocation of Canterbury, with Archbishop Whitgift at its head, appointed only one book besides the Bible to be studied by the clergy, and that was a work by Bullinger, of Zurich, a non-episcopal divine.‡‡

"With such testimony as this, who can reasonably deny that the recognition

* *Of the Church*, ed., 1628, lib. 3, c. 39, p. 166.

† Conclusion of a letter written from Paris, in 1650, to a Mr. Cordel.

‡ *Vindication of Protestant Principles*. Gibson's *Preserv.* Vol. III. p. 410.

§ D'Oyly's *Life of Sancroft*, I. 325.

|| *Mosheim*, by MacLaine, Vol. VI. p. 184, ed. 1826.

¶ Answer to Mayhew, p. 68.

** *Exposition of Art. 28*, ed. 1799, p. 397.

†† *Statement respecting Jerusalem Bishopric*, p. 6.

‡‡ Preface to *Bullinger's Decades*, ed. Parker Soc.

of non-episcopal orders is in accordance with the spirit, the history, and the standards of our church?" pp. 20-24.

Dr. Smith might have brought forward much more evidence, although he has presented enough to establish his position. Keble, in the preface to his edition of Hooker, expressly admits that the allowance of the validity of non-episcopal ordination in this "judicious" author was designed to cover the case of the Continental Protestant Churches, that there might be no rupture of fellowship with them. The reader who has not access to the original authorities will find by turning to Hallam's "Constitutional History of England" (an unquestioned authority) full confirmation of the ground taken by Dr. Smith respecting the position of the English Episcopal Church in the age of Elizabeth. The Zurich Letters embracing the correspondence of the Anglican with the Helvetic Reformers are replete with proofs of the entire mutual fellowship between the English and the Calvinistic Churches, and of the full and cordial recognition of the latter on the part of Jewel and the other great men to whom the Church of England looks up as to its founders and oracles. The Episcopalian denomination, as far as it denies the validity of non-episcopal ordination, forsakes the example of the fathers and takes up an intensely narrow and sectarian position. For the honor of our common Christianity, it is to be hoped that vituperation of journals, like the *Church Review*, will not blind the eyes of American Episcopalians to the facts of history and induce them to give power into the hands of the party that would unchurch all Protestant Christendom except the members of a single denomination. At any rate let not this narrow ecclesiasticism pretend to bolster itself up by reference to the Reformers who organized their Church and formed its Articles; for the idea of excluding from ecclesiastic fellowship their Protestant brethren never occurred to their thoughts. Well does Dr. Smith observe, that if the opinion that non-episcopal orders are lawful is not to be tolerated in the Episcopal Church, then they are bound "to all the logical consequences which its denial involves—to the monstrous assumption that this Church is *the* Church of Christ in this land, that in her alone are treasured up the covenanted blessings of grace, and that all outside of her fold are left to the uncovenanted mercies of God. It is impossible, in this country, and this nineteenth century, to accept such a position and such consequences as these."

We have no space left for extracts from Dr. Muhlenberg's in-

teresting letter addressed to a friend. He is too old an offender against sectarian prejudices to feel very badly at incurring the censure of the Bishop. He affords no indication of any purpose to change his course; and on the whole, the Bishop must rise from the reading of these various replies with the feeling that his lot is cast among an incorrigible generation.

GOULBURN'S DEVOTIONAL STUDY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.*—This neat little book gives, in eleven chapters, the author's ideas as to the devotional use of the Bible, with seven skeleton meditations as specimens, and an appendix consisting of two sermons developing more fully particular points. It treats of the function of the Bible in the plan of salvation, as the established ordinance through which God addresses man; of attention and thought, and the distinction between them, as parallel to the receiving and the digesting of food; of some general analogies between the Bible and nature which go to prove the necessity of meditation in the use of the former; of times and places appropriate for such meditation; of the Old Testament as adapted to man's moral nature; of the New Testament as also adapted,—the Gospels to his affections, the Epistles to his reason, the Apocalypse to his imagination; of the necessity of the teaching of the Holy Spirit throughout. The last chapter is an example of a meditation on our Lord's words, "Give me to drink," and the two sermons are, one on the true idea of the Holy Communion, the other on the changes in the method of revelation as the early church was developed.

The book is disfigured by an excessive and inconsistent use of capital letters. The inconsistencies may be due to the American proof-reader, but the original weakness must be charged, we judge, upon the English clergyman. Even the brief preface bristles with "Adults," "Youth," "Religious Exercises," "Sixth Edition." In spite of this trifling blemish, it contains many valuable suggestions, and we need not say to those who have read Dr. Goulburn's "Thoughts on Personal Religion" (republished here about two years ago) that this new work breathes throughout a spirit of pure, humble, and practical piety. It has indeed certain defects of style, occasional affectations, and an excess of imagina-

* *An Introduction to the Devotional Study of the Holy Scriptures.* By EDWARD METRICK GOULBURN, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1886. pp. 193. New Haven: H. C. Peck. Price \$1.25.

tion, but these are forgotten in the interest of the thoughts. The only serious objection we have to the book is the fear that its suggestions cannot be observed without danger of formalism. It seems hardly possible to act upon a series of directions so minute, guiding the exercise of the memory, the reason, the affections, the imagination, the will, in the act of devotional meditation,—to follow them consciously, we say,—without falling into a mechanical formality, which would be fatal to devotional meditation. If one can avoid this, the book will be precious to him, as its predecessor mentioned above, has been to many earnest Christians.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

THE LIFE OF SAMUEL ADAMS.*—This work, in the exterior finish of its topography, in the careful researches in which it is founded, and in the judicious and impartial character of its contents, forms a beautiful and substantial addition to the department of American history. It is a worthy monument to a great patriot, erected by one of his descendants. For various reasons, the career of Samuel Adams had never been adequately described. He was an older man than his kinsman John Adams, than Jefferson, than Washington, and most of the leading actors in the Revolution. In respect to age, he stood mid-way between Franklin, who was born in 1706, and the generation of men to which belong the names just mentioned. His services were mostly on a more confined theatre, and were performed with his pen. But he, more, probably, than any other individual, laid the foundations on which other men built. He was much more prudent and consistent than his great associate in the work of constitutional resistance to the aggressions of Great Britain, James Otis. He took no rash step. Yet he was fearless, and prompt to act in an emergency. He was employed for a long series of years in drafting the remonstrances, the petitions, the addresses, and other patriotic papers, which emanated from the town of Boston and the Assembly of the Massachusetts colony, and by which the fire of liberty was fanned into a

* *The Life and Public Services of Samuel Adams*, being a narrative of his acts and opinions, and of his agency in producing and forwarding the American Revolution, with extracts from his Correspondence, State Papers, and Political Essays. By WILLIAM V. WELLS. Three vols. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1865. New Haven: Judd & White. Price, \$12.

flame at home, at the same time that the real posture and claims of America were made known abroad. He was disinterested, unambitious, simple and frugal in his personal habits and mode of life, and absorbed from early youth in the cause of American rights. He not only wrote and spoke in an official capacity, but he was also a frequent contributor to the newspapers, and, indeed, omitted no effort which might conduce to the securing of the liberties of his countrymen. He served in the Congress after the war began; and after it closed, he became Governor of Massachusetts. He was an adherent, in his old age, of the Republican or anti-Federal party, an opponent of Jay's treaty, and a friend and correspondent of Jefferson.

It should be stated that Mr. Bancroft has made a careful study of the life and character of Samuel Adams, and has done him full justice. These volumes of Mr. Wells, however, of course enter much more into details, and constitute a fine narrative of the events which prepared the way for the Revolutionary War, as well as of interesting features of the conflict itself.

FROTHINGHAM'S LIFE AND TIMES OF JOSEPH WARREN.*—It is a happy circumstance that the memoirs of two such men as Joseph Warren and Samuel Adams should be given to the public so nearly at the same time. The memoir of each throws light on the career of the other. Mr. Frothingham says of them what was once said of Hampden and Pym: "These great men went in perfect harmony together. They shared the same beliefs and purposes, the same hopes and resolves, the same enemies and friends, in common to the end."

The life of Warren has been written before by several biographers, but on a much smaller scale. The story of his generous devotion to the cause of his country has been rehearsed, also, on more than one public occasion, by the most eloquent and best known of American orators. Still there was room for another tribute to his memory. Warren not only died for his country, the first martyr in the War of Independence, but he rendered services which, up to the time of his death, can hardly be ranked second to those of any other man. Yet the most valuable of these services

* *Life and Times of Joseph Warren.* By RICHARD FROTHINGHAM. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1865. 8vo. pp. 558. New Haven: Judd & White. Price, \$3.50.

were of such a kind as not to attract special attention, and there was danger that they would be forgotten by a succeeding generation. Mr. Frothingham, living under the shadow of the monument on Bunker Hill, and looking down from his windows upon the spot, close by, where the young, "brave, blooming, generous, self-devoted martyr," as one of his earlier biographers calls him, yielded up his life, has been prompted to undertake the task, for which he will receive the thanks of every American. Diligently, lovingly, with all painstaking, he has traced him in the work to which he devoted himself so ardently and persistently, from 1767 to 1775, and has now linked the name of Warren forever with one of the most important periods in the history of the country. Daniel Webster said: "It was a thinking community that achieved our Revolution, before a battle had been fought." Mr. Frothingham has shown how Warren, Samuel Adams, and the others of that noble band of Boston patriots, prepared that "thinking community" for independence. Others did their part nobly, but these two men are to be remembered forever as preëminent among the early leaders. Mr. Bancroft has sketched the events of the period truthfully and well; but no proper impression of the amount of labor, or the importance of the services rendered by these two men, can be gained, except by following, step by step, all the details of the record as they are given by Mr. Frothingham and Mr. Wells. We do not propose to present even the briefest abstract of this record. The special value of these two Memoirs, it should be understood, is in the impression which they give *as a whole*. We deem it henceforth essential for every one, who would gain any adequate conception of the events which led to the Revolution, to follow these two representative men as they worked on, year after year, in political clubs; by means of the press; in town meetings; through committees of correspondence with the other towns of Massachusetts; and then, when the idea of Union dawned, through committees of correspondence with the other colonies; in committees of safety; in the General Congress; in the Provincial Congress; till at last the collision came, and the appeal was made to arms. Then we find Warren hastening to every place of danger; to Grape Island, to Lexington, to Noddle's Island, and, on the memorable seventeenth of June, to Bunker's Hill. But we must forbear. It is perhaps enough to say that Mr. Frothingham has completed a work which will require little revision hereafter, or addition from any other hand.

But while commending this Memoir so highly, we must say that there are some inaccuracies of statement that have surprised us. For example, on page 378, Mr. Frothingham declares that the "theological element had nothing to do with the great movement of the American Revolution." The proof which is adduced of this remarkable statement signally and altogether fails to show any such thing. It is supposed to be found in a "card" from Warren, which was published in the Boston newspapers, for the purpose of propitiating the Episcopalians of Massachusetts. For obvious reasons, the Episcopalians throughout New England were inclined to side with the English government, and were beginning to feel that they must commend themselves to the powers across the water by active opposition to the revolutionary party. Many of them had already made themselves exceedingly obnoxious by what they had said and done. The object of Warren naturally was to counteract this feeling, and to lead them if possible to join their countrymen in resistance to the encroachments on their rights that had been attempted. In this "card," therefore, he gave publicity to a fact, just communicated to him in a letter from Samuel Adams, which he thought might have an influence with this class of people. It says that the General Congress had been opened with prayer by an *Episcopal* clergyman, Rev. Mr. Duche; and he naturally took the occasion to enlarge upon the fact that many of the warmest friends of the cause in the Southern colonies were Church-of-England men. Now the only conclusion that can possibly be drawn from such a "card" as this is that the leaders were desirous of allaying any sectarian jealousy that might be felt by a particular denomination. We should have supposed that, in the passage alluded to, Mr. Frothingham had written "theological" by mistake—meaning to say *sectarian*—were there not one or two other passages which have led us to suspect some prejudice, or some want of acquaintance with the relations of religious men and religious faith to the great struggle then going on, which renders him incapable of fully understanding the real state of the case.

FIVE YEARS IN CHINA.*—The faithful portrait at the beginning

* *Five Years in China*; or the Factory Boy made a Missionary. The Life and Observations of Rev. William Aitchison, late Missionary to China. By Rev. CHARLES P. BUSH, A. M. "I will bring the blind by a way they know not." Philadelphia: Pres. Pub. Com. 18mo. pp. 284. New Haven: F. T. Jarman. Price, \$1.25.

of this little volume, and the explanatory words of its title-page, carry us back most pleasantly in memory to the years of the past. The name of William Aitchison is connected so closely with the company who were, twenty years ago, united in all the earnest work, and all the ardent enthusiasms, and all the warm friendships, and all the joyful hopes of our student life in Yale College; the story of his simple, elevated, self-forgetful and self-consecrating piety is so suggestive of the time when that piety won our regard and admiration, as its influence was ever present and powerful among that company of educated young men, that, in the reading of his brief history, we seem for the moment to have been mingling once more in the old scenes, and communing once more with the old friends who are now so widely scattered throughout this world, and even, so many of them, in the higher life of the better world. Were it only, then, for the calling up anew of kindly recollections of that delightful period, which, as the progress of years bears us away from it into severer duties or graver responsibilities, loses so much of the distinctness though so little of the brightness of the early experience, we should gladly express to the author our grateful sense of the service he has done for ourselves, in preserving the record of this devoted missionary's career. But the volume, unpretending as it is, and covering in its narrative only those years which, in every man's life, must of necessity be mainly years of preparation, cannot fail, as we think, to interest any reader who will give a few hours to its perusal, while we are sure that every such reader will rise from its perusal with a hearty respect for the character which it sets forth—though it be, indeed, the character not of a friend but of a stranger—and with a deep sense of the glory of a life which, as it loses or leaves behind it everything that is loved on earth, gives itself wholly to a service whose reward can be hoped for only in Heaven.

Like so many men who have risen to positions of usefulness or honor in this country, and, especially, to positions of usefulness or honor in the missionary service, Mr. Aitchison was in early life in humble circumstances, and acquired his education only by the most unwearied exertions. He was a native of Scotland, but came to America when he was about eight years old, with his parents, who settled in Greeneville, a part of the town of Norwich, Connecticut. Here, in his early boyhood, he was set at work in a factory, owing to the limited means of his father, and continued in

this employment three or four years, until his eagerness for study, which was largely increased by the new impulses that he gained at the time of his conversion, had become too great to be any longer restrained. Friends, who saw the nobler aspirations within him, and the earnest desire which began, almost immediately, to bear him on toward the ministry of the Gospel as his work in life, were led to feel that his was too bright a mind and too ardent a soul to be limited to the life of a common New England cotton mill, and, in confidence of the future, they came forward generously to give him the help within their power. By his own efforts and the aid thus afforded him, he was at length enabled to enter Yale College, where, in the year 1848, he was graduated with high honor. He immediately entered upon a course of theological study in the Seminary at New Haven, and after three years of residence here, during one of which he filled the office of Tutor in the College, he began the work of preaching the Gospel. His desires had long been to labor among the heathen, but after his marriage, though his wife shared in his wishes and purposes, her health was such as to prevent his accomplishing them. He accordingly entered with earnestness upon the work of the ministry at home, and was for a while a successful preacher in two or three different places. But the death of his wife in 1852, and of his only child not long afterward, severed the strongest ties which bound him to the land of his home and education, and thus the way, which had been hitherto closed, was opened mysteriously in the providence of God, while the call from distant lands sounded more clearly in his hearing than ever before. We cannot but remark here, in passing, upon the tender and beautiful affection with which he cherished the memory of his wife even to the end, and the emptiness which this world seemed to have to his view without her presence—a faithful love for the dead, than which, in whomsoever it exists, there is nothing more beautiful in our human life.

On the 11th of April, 1854, he sailed for China, where he was engaged in missionary labors for a period of five years, until his death, in August, 1859. Nearly the whole of the volume, as might be expected from its title, is devoted to the account of his life in that distant part of the world. So far as his peculiar work in carrying the Gospel to the heathen is concerned, the story is the ordinary, simple narrative of a missionary's course. The slow progress in the acquisition of a difficult language; the consequent long

and patient waiting before the possibility can come of bearing witness for the truth; the joy with which, "with stammering tongue," the message of salvation is first proclaimed; the careful and continual seeking after opportunities of urging upon the benighted people the claims of the Scriptures; the trials and perils which spring from indifference and opposition of every kind; the constant and overwhelming sense of the insignificance of the laborer and his labors, as compared with the almost limitless extent of the work to be done; the few conversions which strengthen the heart as they follow one another at intervals, and which point forward to that future time when the fullness of the Divine blessing shall have come even to those lands;—all these things are found in the life of every one who takes upon himself this great service for Christ, and they meet us impressively as, in the reading of the extracts from his journal and correspondence, we try to enter into Mr. Aitchison's feelings as he looked out upon the field around him. Of his "observations" of the customs and many striking things in that part of the world, concerning which we have comparatively so little knowledge, we can only say that they are of such interest as usually characterizes the familiar and friendly letters of an ordinary cultivated traveler, but, at the same time and naturally enough, they do not open to us any very extensive or clear insight into the peculiarities of China. We do not desire, however, to approach the book in the way of criticism, and, for the object for which it is designed, it is doubtless full and satisfactory enough in this regard.

After this manner, in laborings and journeyings—exposed to trials and dangers—sorrowful yet rejoicing—he lived on for five years of faithful service, and then came the end. The account of his death is as touching as it is simple. He had attended the American Ambassador and his suite, as an interpreter, on their journey to Pekin. The weather being excessively hot, and a recent attendance upon his friend and associate, Rev. William Allen Macy, during the trying illness which ended in his death, having greatly impaired his strength, he was attacked by a severe sickness while in that city. The only hope of recovery seemed to lie in his removal to the sea-coast, a wearisome journey of several days by land and water. Notwithstanding all efforts, however, and in spite of the unwearied kindness of his attending physician and friends, he sank away rapidly, and on Monday morning, the 15th of August, 1869, as they drew near the sea, and as he was re-

olining in his palanquin, which was borne by mules over the rough road—in the interval between two visits of his physician, and thus without the presence of any friend—"his weary spirit took its flight." "He closed his eyes in death, all unseen and unattended, except as the angels came to bear him in triumph to the bosom of his God and Saviour." Three days afterward—as it was found impossible to convey his body to Shanghai—the burial service was read on board the American Ambassador's vessel, and "the coffin, with its precious freight, was reverently passed over the side of the ship, and lowered into the unfolding waves of the Gulf of Pichili, a part of the China Sea, there to rest until the sea shall give up its dead."

"Singular, and almost prophetic," says the author, "were some lines of a little poem written by Mr. Aitchison twelve years before, entitled 'the Time to Die.' It consists of five stanzas; we transcribe only the last two :

'Bury me not at the close of day,
When the twilight softly fades away,
When a deathlike stillness fills the air,
And goodness kneels at the place of prayer.
Be not the churchyard my place of rest,
Let no hallowed dust fall on my breast;
Where sleep my fathers, let me not sleep,
May loved ones over my grave ne'er weep.

'But let me die at the midnight hour,
When winds howl loud, and dark clouds low'r;
With no friend near to close my fixed eye,
Or bend his ear for my last faint sigh.
Let no speaking marble mark the spot,
Where 'neath the clods my body shall rot;
There let me rest from earth's toilsome strife,
Till God shall wake me to endless life.'

Not beneath the clods of the valley, as we have seen, but beneath the waves of the sea, his body sleeps and waits the resurrection morn; and so his lonely wanderings ceased, and his happy spirit ascended to the loved ones gone before, to that blessed Saviour who had stood by him and strengthened him amid all the trials of his pilgrimage." "To the memory of Mr. Aitchison," the author adds, "a fitting monument was raised by the missionaries, in their little cemetery at Shanghai, telling the story of his early death. Here the beloved and lamented Macy was buried, and over his grave a

marble shaft had been erected by his Chinese friends, a voluntary tribute of admiration and love to one who had laid down his life for their nation. Beside this pillar, and like it in shape, was the monument raised to the memory of Aitchison. United in life, in death they were not long divided."

The work which William Aitchison did during those five years in China, so far as its present manifest results are concerned, seems but a small one. He had made but the first beginnings, and, to human eyes, everything which he accomplished may, at an early day, seem to have passed away. A life so brief and so near the beginning of the evangelizing of such a mighty nation must, of necessity, fade out of view in the present, but we cannot but believe that, at some distant period, the men who took their lives in their hands, and commenced the work of proclaiming the Gospel in heathen lands, will be seen to have done the noblest work of the world's history, and will gain the honor and reward of those who give a new life to the perishing millions.

We have written of this little volume at greater length than the ordinary reader might think to be fitting, but we have done so under the influence of the memories of the past. We lay the book aside with the same pleasant memories still abiding with us—memories of many with whom, in various ways, our thoughts of the past are linked. But over the graves of the two who fell so early in the midst of their work in China, we feel that not only ourselves but many of our readers, who knew them in New Haven years ago, may well linger with a kindly recollection of what they were in other days, and with a joyful confidence that they are now in the fullness of that more beautiful and perfect life, to which they looked forward, and for which so wonderfully God had prepared them.

LIFE OF ROBERT OWEN.*—This book is a clear and well-written sketch of the life and enterprises of the very remarkable person whose name it bears. The design of the writer is to derive from this story a deeper conviction of the truth that it is not circumstances which are at fault, but men themselves—that to cure the ills of life, and to effect the greatly needed reforms in society, we must rely upon Christianity to renovate the heart. In prose-

* *Life of Robert Owen*. Philadelphia: Astmead & Evans. 1866. 12mo. pp. 264.

cution of this design, the author gives a consecutive account of the great projects to which Mr. Owen devoted his wealth, his zeal, and his energy, never abating one jot of heart or hope till the end. The story is remarkably well told, and a very clear impression is made of his entire public career. The writer does full justice to all Mr. Owen's excellent characteristics, but never forgets to inculcate the lesson to be derived from his failures. We think that perhaps the impression would have been more salutary if he had recognized more distinctly the truth that Christianity not only changes the hearts of men, but also of itself improves their circumstances, and that the circumstances thus changed for the better will react with great power for the advancement of Christianity itself—that neatness, thrift, mutual helpfulness, charity, condescension, are indirectly but truly the appropriate “fruits of the Spirit,” and that the Christian Church ought to propose to itself many more of the physical and social ameliorations for which Owen labored. The book is very well prepared, and very neatly printed.

MISCELLANEOUS.

ACROSS THE CONTINENT.*—Perhaps no book published during the year will be read by more persons than this, in which Mr. Bowles gives an account of the “Summer’s Journey” which he made last year to the Rocky Mountains, the Mormons, and the Pacific States. There is no one who does not feel an interest of some kind in the new communities which are so rapidly growing up on the Eastern and Western slopes of the Rocky Mountains. Mr. Lincoln used to say that the United States “holds there the treasury of the world.” We feel already, and are to feel more and more, the political influence of those far Western States. Grave questions are coming up for solution with regard to the Mormons. There can be no doubt that our future as a nation is to be materially affected by the development of the wonderful mineral resources of the mining States. The economist, the politician, the Christian philanthropist, are all looking towards the Pacific with hope and confidence. This book, therefore, cannot but receive more than ordinary attention. It gives the most recent information with regard to the condition of things on the

* *Across the Continent.* A Summer’s Journey to the Rocky Mountains, the Mormons, and the Pacific States, with **SPEAKER COLFAX**. By **SAMUEL BOWLES**, Editor of the Springfield (Mass.) Republican. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865. 12mo. pp. 452. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$2.

Pacific coast. Mr. Bowles enjoyed rare advantages for seeing all that is most important, and for forming an intelligent opinion. He accompanied Mr. Speaker Colfax in his extended tour of inspection over the plains, to San Francisco, Oregon, Puget's Sound, and Vancouver's Island. He shows himself to have been an active and shrewd observer, and his conclusions are deserving of high respect, though in some of his statements we are satisfied he has fallen into error. He is, also, manifestly desirous of avoiding all exaggeration; yet he is buoyant, hopeful, and in full sympathy with the people by whom he was received as an honored guest. The space at our command forbids us to give even the briefest abstract of what he says of the Mines, the Mormons, the Pacific Railroad, the Chinese; or of the wonderful natural beauty of the mountains, the valleys, the solemn forests of pine and oak, the majestic rivers, which like the Columbia vie with the Mississippi in length; or the cataracts, many times higher than Niagara. But while commending the book so highly, we must say what under the circumstances is, perhaps, not surprising, that in a literary point of view it is very open to criticism. We have rarely read a book written in such slipshod style! It fairly smells of the stage-coach! The greater part was undoubtedly written in one; and we marked, till we were tired, passage after passage which bears unmistakable marks of having been dictated, as it was being put on paper, by some unlucky bounce of the coach as it sank and rose on the rough roads over which the party seem to have been whirled at break-neck speed. It is a great pity that the book did not receive a careful revision after the author returned to New England.

Two of Mr. Bowles's anecdotes we cannot forbear transferring to our pages. One is told of Senator Nesmith of Oregon. On going "to Washington and seeing the august Capitol, and the dignified Senate, he wondered how he came to be sent there; but after being there a few weeks, his wonder was still greater how the rest of them got there!" The second is told of Gen. Fremont, as illustrating his career in California, and especially his management of the famous Mariposa Mines. "Why," said the General, "When I came to California, I was worth nothing, and now I owe two millions of dollars!"

AGASSIZ'S GRAHAM LECTURES.*—These Lectures have the following titles:—I. Four different Plans of Structure among Animals. II. Relative Standing or Gradation of the Animal Kingdom. III. Remote Antiquity of Animal Life as shown in the Coral Reefs. IV. Physical History of the Earth.—Mau the Ultimate Object. V. Triple Coincidence in the Succession, Gradation, and Growth of Animals. VI. Evidence of an Intelligent and constantly Creative Mind in the Plans and Variations of Structure. To those who are acquainted with Professor Agassiz's previous writings, this volume presents little that is new. It shows some marks of incorrect reporting or imperfect revision. The author stands, as formerly, on the firm ground of Theism. He has lost none of his energy in opposing the Darwinian speculation. We notice the volume chiefly to point out a few etymological errors, which deface, however, but a single page of this interesting volume.

On page 29, Professor Agassiz illustrates the unity of type under variety of form which is found in the structure of animals, by an example borrowed from the science of language. He traces the word "father" through various languages, and explains the different forms which it assumes, e. g. in the Greek and Latin, "pater," in French, "père," in Italian, "padre," in the German, "vater," by what he is pleased to call Grimm's law, and which he thus defines: "It is found that the hard letters are the older, and that they have gradually softened in the course of time. Thus *b*, *p*, and *ph*, which are equal to *f* or *v* in pronunciation, have succeeded each other very much in the same manner, as *d*, *t*, and *th*, or as *g*, *k*, and *ch*; and all the words in which these letters occur among the ancient, and especially the Southern languages, have at later periods been transformed into other languages."

The utter nonsense of this last sentence is doubtless to be charged in part to the reporter, and not altogether to the lecturer; but if Grimm's law amounted to no more than what is here stated, both the merit and the value of the discovery would be reduced to a small fraction of what they actually are. Professor Agassiz makes up however for his very inadequate and incorrect statement

* *The Structure of Animal Life*. Six Lectures delivered at the Brooklyn Academy of Music, in January and February, 1862. By LOUIS AGASSIZ, Professor of Zoology and Geology in the Lawrence Scientific School. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$2.50.

of the law by extending its application to the Italian and the French with which it has nothing whatever to do.

He continues, "If I were to dwell upon this subject, I might go a step farther, and show you that the Hebrew word "baré," (bara?) (to create, to make, to prepare), is the same as the word to "bear" (to bring forth); and that here again we have the root of the word "pater" (the originator, or father); and still further, that a host of derivations, such as "parent," &c., are brought into this association, merely undergoing the slight change of outer form or intonation, showing the generic connection of all these words." It is very unfortunate that we are not furnished the proofs by which this connection is established. In default of these we may be permitted to express a doubt whether it really exists. First, the Hebrew "bara," the original signification of which is to cut, to fashion, and so to create, is identified with the word to "bear," (to bring forth, and also to carry). The resemblance in form and meaning is not so striking as to produce an irresistible conviction of their identity, especially when we consider that no sound etymologist would attempt to trace any etymological connection in words belonging to languages so remote from each other as those of the Semitic and the Indo-European families, how close soever the resemblance in other respects. Next, we have, in "bear," the root of the word "pater." But if Professor Agassiz had taken the pains to trace the word back to the Latin, he would find that the corresponding form is *fero* and not *pater*; and in the Sanscrit the roots still exist in the separate forms of *bhar* and *pā*. Again, "pater" is associated with "parent." But "parent" is from the Latin *pario*, and has no connection with either of the preceding forms.

If Professor Agassiz were capable of appreciating the absurdity of all this, there would be more of forbearance, in the future, in his treatment of those early naturalists who thought the whale a fish. Were it not that he has elsewhere given expression to views on this subject equally absurd, we might suppose that he did not regard the so-called science of language as capable of any severer method, and was covertly ridiculing its claims to the rank of a science.

WHITTIER'S "SNOW-BOUND."*—Before the cold weather vanishes and the fires go out on the—we cannot say hearth-stone—in the hot-air furnaces and air-tight stoves, and the rest of the unpoetical substitutes for the ancient hearth-stone, we counsel our friends to read—if possible aloud, and to the family circle in the evening—this charming little poem of Whittier. It is the picture of a winter evening in a rural part of New England, when the family are shut in by a snow-storm, and of the path-cleaving labors of the day following.

"All day the heavy meteor fell;
And when the second morning shone,
We looked upon a world unknown,
On nothing we could call our own."

* * * * *

"We cut the solid whiteness through.
And, where the drift was deepest, made
A tunnel walled and overlaid
With dazzling crystal; we had read
Of rare Aladdin's wondrous cave,
And to our own his name we gave,
With many a wish the luck were ours
To test his lamp's supernal powers."

There are passages replete with pathos; and the whole poem is a gem of its kind. Whittier's verse is occasionally unpolished, but always inspired by true poetic feeling.

THE WORKS OF EPICTETUS.†—Epictetus, of Hierapolis in Phrygia, was a freedman, who taught the Stoic philosophy, first at Rome, then at Nicopolis, in Epirus. His pupil, Arrian, compiled from his teachings eight books of commentaries, of which four are still extant. These commentaries, the manual (*Encheiridion*) which is brief, and a few fragments, are the only sources of our knowledge respecting his doctrine. The energy and excellence of the sentiments which he uttered upon human life and duty, have rendered these works attractive to thinking men. They present an ennobled and purified form of the philosophy of the porch. The present volume is the old English translation of Elizabeth Carter, as revised by Mr. Higginson.

* "Snow-Bound." A Winter Idyl. By JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 16mo. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$1.25.

† *The Works of Epictetus*. Consisting of his Discourses in Four Books, the *Encheiridion* and Fragments. A translation from the Greek, based on that of Elizabeth Carter. By THOMAS WENTWORTH HIGGINSON. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1866. Price \$2.50.

ALDEN'S ELEMENTS OF INTELLECTUAL PHILOSOPHY.*—This small volume should be styled studies in Intellectual Philosophy, rather than elements of the science. It is not the less interesting for that reason, though it may not be so useful for the purposes of teaching. It consists of a series of remarks upon the principal topics with which the science of the mind is concerned, arranged in brief chapters. These remarks embrace many of the most important definitions, with many sensible and acute critical observations, suggested by the defective and incorrect statements of leading philosophers. Like very many text-books upon this subject, it presupposes that the reader will have before him the works of the authors who are criticised, or that the few sentences which are quoted will suffice to awaken an interest in their opinions and theories. The author overlooks the circumstance that he writes from a full knowledge of, and a strong interest in these theories, while his readers are ordinarily not sufficiently acquainted with the facts and truths to which these theories relate to enter into the import of the questions which concern them.

The author has read extensively the leading English writers, and some of his criticisms upon Hamilton and others do great credit to his acuteness. The style of the work is lucid, and the illustrations are apt and enlivening. In the hands of a capable instructor, it might be a serviceable text-book. To the student who has thought and read somewhat upon the science, it will prove a very interesting and useful volume.

MASSACHUSETTS ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.†—This work is one of much value to Congregationalists. It embraces a condensed, but lucid, survey of the history of ecclesiastical legislation in Massachusetts. The present condition of the law in that State is accurately defined. Abundant references are made to legal decisions, and also to theological reviews and other writings, which have a bearing on the subject. Every page shows great carefulness and research. The author is a lawyer by profession, but a gentleman whose legal lore coexists with a vein of humor, which

* *Elements of Intellectual Philosophy.* By REV. JOSEPH ALDEN, D. D., LL. D. late President of Jefferson College, New York. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 292. New Haven: H. C. Peck.

† *Massachusetts Ecclesiastical Law.* By EDWARD BUOK, of the Suffolk Bar. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1866. New Haven: Judd & White.

occasionally sparkles on the pages of this sober treatise. We should add that the copious indexes increase the value of this volume, by rendering its contents fully available.

LUNT'S ORIGIN OF THE LATE WAR.*—The author of this volume was an old Whig, who suffered himself to be drawn into the Democratic ranks, before the outbreak of the war, by his disgust at those political movements in Massachusetts, which destroyed the ascendancy of "the ancient and honorable" Whig leaders, and sent Mr. Charles Sumner to the United States Senate, and Mr. Nathaniel P. Banks to the House of Representatives. He has never forgiven Massachusetts, nor the United States, for these so-considered political mistakes, and the movements which occasioned them. Having himself committed a most unfortunate error, he may, perhaps, have never forgiven himself. At all events, he has given just such a theory concerning the origin of the late war, as might be expected from a person who holds the position described. It is very different in many respects from Mr. Buchanan's History of his own administration, and it introduces a great number of facts which Mr. Buchanan does not notice. A very large portion of the volume is occupied with a recital of the domestic politics of the Bay State, which is to be accounted for by the circumstance that the author finds in them matter for much bitter reflection, but which is excused by him by the consideration that the agitations which originated in Massachusetts had very much to do with the origin of the war. The most discreditable and unworthy passage in the volume which we have chanced to notice is the author's estimate of President Lincoln. That so able and cultivated a man as Mr. Lunt should have allowed himself to be so far misled by his prejudices, as to fail to appreciate Mr. Lincoln's true greatness, excites in us far more pity for the critic, than for the person whom the critic fails to honor.

LEONARD SCOTT'S REPRINTS OF THE BRITISH PERIODICALS.—American readers of the English Reviews did not need the experience of the last six years to teach them what estimate to put on the Articles in which American affairs were discussed. Still, notwithstanding the lessons which we had had, there was some natu-

* *The Origin of the late War*: traced from the beginning of the Constitution to the revolt of the Southern States. By GEORGE LUNT. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 491.

ral indignation, on the first breaking out of the slaveholders' rebellion, at the flippant tone which they adopted, and the unfriendly and disingenuous spirit which they hastened to manifest. But we soon learned what to expect; and paid very little attention either to their criticisms, or oracular prophecies; except when some writer more than usually spiteful awakened a hearty laugh. We believed that Right and Justice would succeed; and no more allowed the sneers of English sympathizers with rebellion to diminish the affection with which we had always regarded England, than the outrageous abuse of Northern copperheads to affect our love for our own native land. And now that a change is perceptible in the tone of some of the magazines which so short a time ago heaped abuse upon us, we do not flatter ourselves that the *animus* of the writers is changed one whit, but are thankful that we can enjoy our laugh even more to our own satisfaction than before.

As a rather amusing, and perhaps exaggerated example of the change to which we refer, we place upon our pages two extracts from the lucubrations of that witty contributor to *Blackwood's Magazine*, "Cornelius O'Dowd." The first is taken from the Number for January, 1865;—a few weeks before the collapse of the rebellion:

"Another cause also contributed not a little to the continuance of this struggle—the immense notoriety it has attracted throughout the world to America and the Americans. These people, for the first time in their lives, found themselves an object of European interest. Up to this they had been little known as a people at this side of the Atlantic. A rare ingenuity in mechanical invention, and a very curious taste in drinks, had certainly been associated with their name; but beyond gun-stocks and gin-juleps, sherry-cobblers and India-rubber boots, they had not been supposed to have conferred much on humanity. To become suddenly famous as a great military nation was then an immense bribe to national vanity. Hitherto it was their boast to consume more *paté de foie gras*, more champagne, and more Parisian finery, than any other people; but what if they could rival France in glory as well as gluttony. * * *

"Now, I am much disposed to believe that these people would have made peace long ago if we had not given them so much of our attention and our interest. If, instead of sending out our own graphic correspondent to describe, and our artist to draw them, we had treated the whole as a vulgar, commonplace row, from which there was no one useful lesson to be learned, moral or military;—had we ignored them in our journals, and forgotten them in our leaders—had the public speakers of our platforms omitted all their dreary lamentations over 'fratricidal conflict' and 'decimating war,' my conviction is, the combatants would have been chewing the cud of peace together two years since.

"You made a ring for them, and what could they do but fight! You backed this one against that, and they went in with a will, only too proud to attract so respectable an audience, and be a matter of notoriety to such a well-dressed company. Had you really been sincere, you would have turned your backs on the performance. Had you felt half the horror you pretend, you would have gone home and declared the sight too disgusting to look on. * * *

"You cannot make marshals of France out of drab-coated Philadelphians or pedantic Bostonians, no more than you can make the very names of their battle-fields ring in verse.

"Think of Rancocus, Little Lick, Spottsylvania, and Funksville, and ask a Yankee laureate to commemorate them. What are poets to do with Murfreesborough, and Bull's Run, and Orange Court House, redolent as they are of 'liquoring up' and the tobacco quid?"

The second will be found in the Number for March, 1866 :

"America dares to hold language to France that all Europe combined dare not utter. There's no denying it; there's no qualifying it. If we had a Continental coalition to-morrow, we could not venture to say what America has just said. What Minister, of Russia, or England, or Austria would say to the French Emperor, 'We were thinking of something else when you slipped into Savoy and Nice the other day; now that our hands are free, you'll have to go back again.' We are famous for brave words in our Foreign Office, but does any one expect that such a message as this will ever issue from Whitehall?"

"We would no more provoke the Tuileries by an insolent dispatch, than we would go into one of Van Amburgh's cages and kick the lion. It has become a sort of European superstition that France can beat every one, and I am downright grateful to the Americans that they don't believe it.

"I never knew I liked America so well till I began to speculate on this war. I never suspected that there really was that tie of kindred which journalists disparage by that false adulation they deal in. I hate all the cant of 'cousinship,' but call them our own bone and blood; speak of them as people who have the same leading traits as ourselves—steady, determined, untiring, unyielding—taking their share of hard knocks to-day with a fixed resolve to pay them to-morrow; in a word, of that stuff that makes right trusty friends and very terrible enemies. Regard them in this light, and say, if a war should break out between them and France, what side would you like to back. I say, America. I'd lay my head on the issue."

But a new interest will be awakened this year in the British periodicals, in consequence of the discussions which they contain of the important questions respecting Reform which are now agitating all England. The leaders of the Reform party—some of them—manifested such warm interest in our cause, and proved themselves such valuable friends in the day of our adversities, that we cannot fail to follow them with our sympathies and good wishes in the struggle in which they are now involved.

THE REBELLION RECORD.—Part 55 of this important work has been issued by D. Van Nostrand, 192 Broadway, New York, and the Record is brought down to June, 1862, and the battles of Cedar Run, Manassas, Port Republic, and Cross-Keys.

OTHER NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Genesis. With a new Translation. By J. G. Murphy, D. D., T. C. D. With a Preface, by J. P. Thompson, D. D. Andover, Mass.: W. F. Draper. 8vo. pp. 519.

Commentary on the New Testament. By Prof. J. P. Lange. Vol. II. Mark. Edited by Rev. W. G. T. Shedd: and Luke, edited by Rev. C. C. Starbuck. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 550.

An Eirenicon, in a letter to the author of "The Christian Year." By E. B. Pusey, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 395.

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost. By Henry Edward, Archbishop of Westminster. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 275.

A Hand-book of Christian Baptism. By R. Ingham. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 8vo. pp. 624.

Abridged Hand-book on Christian Baptism. By R. Ingham. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 16 mo. pp. 76.

The Word of Promise. A Hand-book to the Promises of Scripture. By Horatius Bonar, D. D. Boston: American Tract Society. 16mo. pp. 297.

The Idle Word. Short Religious Essays upon the Gift of Speech, and its Employment in Conversation. By Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 16mo. pp. 203.

The Shadow of Christianity, or the Genesis of the Christian State. A Treatise for the Times. By the author of the *Apocatastasis*. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 16mo. pp. 167.

Lectures of Pastoral Theology. By Enoch Pond, D. D. Andover, Mass.: W. F. Draper. 12mo. pp. 395.

The Highest Civilization a Result of Christianity and Christian Learning; a Discourse delivered at Norwich, Conn., November 14th, 1865. By Ray Palmer, D. D. (A Sermon of uncommon value for the important principles which it lays down, and for the just and forcible arguments by which they are established.)

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.

The History of Henry the Fifth: King of England, Lord of Ireland, and Heir of France. By George Makepeace Towle, Author of "*Glimpses of History*." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 473.

Frederick the Second, called the Great. By Thomas Carlyle. Vol. VI, (the last). New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 608.

Stonewall Jackson, a Military Biography, with a portrait and maps. By John Esten Cooke. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 470.

Richard Cobden, the Apostle of Free Trade. His political career and public

services. A Biography. By John McGilchrist, Author of "The Life of Lord Dundonald," etc. New York: Harper & Brothers. 16mo. pp. 304.

The Centenary of American Methodism: A Sketch of its History, Practical System, and Success, &c., &c. By Abel Stevens, LL. D. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866. (This little volume contains a succinct history of Methodism in England and in the United States, from the pen of Dr. Stevens, whose extended history of the rise and progress of Methodism is favorably known to the public.)

James Lewis Petigru of South Carolina. A Biographical Sketch. By W. J. Grayson. With a Portrait. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 178.

Records of the Life of S. V. S. Wilder. New York: American Tract Society. 12mo. pp. 404.

The Life of the Rev. Robert Baird, D. D. By his son, Henry M. Baird, Professor in the University of the City of New York. New York: A. D. F. Randolph. 12mo. pp. 347.

BELLES LETTRES.

Supplement to the Cyclopædia of American Literature, including Obituaries of Authors, Continuations of former Articles, with Notices of earlier and later Writers omitted in previous editions. By E. A. Duyckinck. New York City: Charles Scribner & Co. Royal 8vo. pp. 164.

The Dutch Pilgrim Fathers, and other Poems, Humorous and not Humorous. By Edward Hopper. New York City: Hurd and Houghton. 16mo. pp. 216.

Poems relating to the American Revolution. By Phillip Freneau. With an introductory Memoir and Notes by Evert A. Duyckinck. New York: W. J. Widdleton. pp. xxxviii. 288.

The Criterion; or the Test of Talk about Familiar Things. A Series of Essays. By Henry T. Tuckerman. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 12mo. pp. 377.

Literature in Letters; or, Manners, Art, Criticism, Biography, History, and Morals, illustrated in the correspondence of eminent persons. Edited by James P. Holcombe, LL. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 520.

Cherry and Violet; a Tale of the Great Plague. By the author of "Mary Powell." New York: M. W. Dodd. 16mo. pp. 239.

Hereward, the last of the English. By Charles Kingsley, author of "Two Years Ago," etc. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 12mo. pp. iv. 397.

Leighton Court. A Country-House Story. By Henry Kingsley, author of "Ravenshoe" and "The Hillyars and the Burtons." Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 16mo. pp. 190.

Hans Brinkle; or the Silver Skates. A Story of Life in Holland. By M. E. Dodge, author of the Irvington Stories. Illustrated by F. O. Darley and Thos. Nast. New York: James O'Kane, Nassau street. 1866. 12mo. pp. 347.

St. Martin's Summer. By Anne H. M. Brewster. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 12mo. pp. 442.

Herman; or Young Knighthood. By E. Foxton. Two volumes. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 12mo. pp. 416, 391.

Honor May. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 16mo. pp. 404.

Miss Oona McQuarrie. A Sequel to Alfred Hagart's Household. By Alexander Smith. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 16mo. pp. 228.

Stories to a Child. By Jean Ingelow. Boston: Roberts Brother, 24mo. pp. 424.

T H E
NEW ENGLANDER.

No. XCVL

JULY, 1866.

ARTICLE I.—THE RELATION OF THOUGHT TO
LANGUAGE.

It has been a question with philologists whether thought can exist independent of language. The mental act and its vocal sign are supposed to have a contemporary origin. The relation of thought to its symbol is somewhat analogous to that of soul and body. Thought is the soul of language, and possibly is, in all cases, indestructible ; while words which are the signs of thought are subject to perpetual change and decay. The same thought does not always occupy the same abode, but changes its residence with the growth of knowledge and the lapse of time. Those intellectual notions which, apart from the pure mathematics, constitute the sum of human learning, are, from age to age, constantly appearing in new forms of expression. Ideas, therefore, undergo a species of metempsychosis. They assume new bodies, when those which they at first inhabited become too strait for them. Each nation has its peculiar modes of thought and expression ; but words, in each successive generation, assume new shades of meaning, or become entirely obsolete. The language of cultivated people differs from that of its infancy as much as the mouth of a majestic river hemmed in by embankments, wharves, and warehouses,

and bearing upon its bosom the commerce of a world, differs from the same river at its source, where the tiny streamlet might be turned aside by the foot of the traveler.

" A pebble in the streamlet scant,
Has turned the course of many a river ;
A dew-drop on the baby plant
Has warped the giant oak forever."

Sometimes the change of signification in the words of a nation is only partial. The tenement of the original thought grows old and wears the marks of decay or disappears. The modification is similar to that which takes place in the human form. Friends who have not met for many years often become unknown to one another. If they associate together daily, they are not conscious of the effect which "decay's effacing fingers" are producing every hour upon their physical organizations. "Vetustas," says Varro, "pauca non depravat, multa tollit. Quem puerum vidisti formosum, hunc vides deformem in senecta. Tertium seculum non videt eum hominem, quem vidit primum." Each breathing moment writes its history on the features of every living being. Thus, by slow gradations, the eye loses its lustre, the hair its glossy hue, the face its kindling glow, the form its youthful elasticity, and the whole constitution at length betokens a speedy dissolution. Words have a similar history. Horace, with his usual beauty and felicity of expression, noted the growth and decay of language.

" As when the forest, with the bending year,
First sheds the leaves which earliest appear,
So, an old age of words maturely dies,
Others new born in youth and vigor rise."

Bailly, the astronomer, observes, "The import of words changes with the times; their signification enlarging with the progress of knowledge. Languages are every moment perishing in detail from the variations introduced by custom; they grow old like those that speak them, and like them gradually alter their features and form." Sometimes, however, the thought seems to be inseparable from its outward tabernacle, and lies forever entombed in its own abode. Hence a dead language is not inaptly styled "fossil poetry," each word enshrouding the offspring of creative imagination, like the shields

of those minute crustaceæ whose petrifications constitute entire mountains; and when those little adamantine shells are ground to powder, they give the most brilliant polish to the keenest Toledo or Damascus blade. So the words of departed genius give acumen to the intellect of the modern student. The occupation of the witty Roman is not yet gone, who playfully says:

"Then let me sharpen others, as the hone
Gives edge to razors, though itself has none,"

or as it is infinitely better expressed in the original,

"Ergo fungar vice cotis, acutum
Reddere quæ ferrum valet, exorsus ipse secandi."

It is wonderful how extensive has been the transmigration of thought in our own language, and yet grammarians give very little attention to the fact. Whole libraries have been written to illustrate the dead languages; sometimes a single Greek particle is made the theme of an entire volume; while a majority of English and American scholars have never during their course of education been taught, nor have they paused to inquire the original meaning of a single particle in our native tongue. In truth, most students look upon prepositions, conjunctions, and articles, as convenient hooks and bands to unite words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, but regard them as utterly insignificant. They are mere expletives without meaning. About once in a century, an acute critic like John Horne Tooke, or Dean Trench, makes the whole literary heavens luminous with his etymological pyrotechnics which are gazed at, admired, quoted, eulogized, and then forgotten. We always take a deeper interest in the remote and obscure both in time and space than in things present and familiar. A piece of mechanism which is always beneath our eye, however complicated and ingenious it may be in construction, ceases to interest. So is it with the structure and signification of the speech we daily use. It changes upon our tongues, and we regard it as immutable; even in our commonest terms a new signification has frequently supplanted the old; and etymology gives us no certain clue to their meaning. The paper on which we write carries us back in imagination to the banks of the Nile, where the infant Moses was cradled; and while we write

the name of the Jewish lawgiver, we are reminded that an important fact in his history is incorporated in it. Pliny affirms that the bark of the Egyptian papyrus was first used for manuscripts after the founding of Alexandria. Prior to this date men wrote upon the leaves of the palm, and afterward upon the bark of certain trees. Sometimes records were upon leaves of lead rolled up, and private documents were made of tablets covered with linen or wax. Our volume, too, had its origin in the sheet of papyrus or parchment which was rolled round a cylinder like a modern map, for preservation. Our book is said to be the Anglo Saxon "boc," which signifies a beech. The wood of that tree was used for the old Runic inscriptions of the Gothic nations. Those mysterious characters called "Runes" were supposed to possess magical powers to stop a sailing vessel or flying arrow, to excite love or hate or even raise the dead. Rude nations always regard written records with awe. The runes were craftily employed by the priesthood to increase the popular superstition. Eccleston, in his "English Antiquities," says that the word itself means *secrecy*. Other critics derive it from the Teutonic word "run" or "runna," which means a furrow or line, and would be equivalent to the English word verse, from "verto," to turn, because when a line of poetry was read or scanned, the reader turned to begin another. The Runic inscriptions were cut upon stone as well as wood. "Very good specimens of Runes may be found on a pillar at Bewcastle, and a font in the church at Bridekirk in Cumberland." They were retained by the Danes and Icelanders as late as the fourteenth century. The Anglo-Saxon word for letter is "staef," possibly associated with the staff or wand on which the runes were cut or engraved. Thus our ancestors converted the bark of trees into books; their foliage furnished us with leaves and their branches with staves or letters. The Bible, that book of books, is but the Greek term for the inner bark of a tree which was of old employed by the scribe. When we speak of an author's style which, a French critic asserts, is the man who writes, the idea suggested is infinitely removed from the stylus or iron graver with which Roman gentlemen wrote on waxen tablets. We denominate the best authors of any age *classics*. We speak of a classical style as indicating perfection

of composition. The phrase "auctores classici" was probably derived from the "classes" which Servius Tullius instituted. He divided the people into five classes, according to their wealth. The pauper multitude were called "censi capite" and were without political influence. They were also called "proletarii," from "proles," offspring, as though their chief vocation was to multiply the *polls*, or the *οὐρελλοί*. The rich and noble only possessed property and power; and the "comitia centuriata" were called to vote by classes, according to their wealth; hence it was an honor, as in modern society and in colleges, to belong to the upper classes. The century first called to vote was named "*prærogativa*." It was natural that this term, "classic," should be transferred to those who were reputed to be the richest in intellectual stores, and enjoyed the *prærogative* of superior scholarship. The men who robbed these original authors of the fruits of their labors, as the Roman poetaster did Virgil, were called "plagiarii." This word was at first applied to kidnappers who were punished with blows and were regarded as a species of legal whipping posts upon which the lictors might break up their fasces. Then it was employed to describe those who stole other men's thoughts or claimed to be the authors of books which they never wrote. So the English word "plagiary" is a legitimate descendant of the Greek *πληγή*, a blow. Plague, with a very different meaning, is from the same root. Sir Philip Sidney, in his "Defense of Poesy," says: "Among the Romans, a poet was called *vates*, which is a diviner, foreseer, or prophet, as by his conjoined words *vaticinium* and *vaticinari* is manifest; so heavenly a title did that excellent people bestow on this heart-ravishing knowledge." [The Vatican is said to derive its name from the same source, because the hill on which the papal palace stands was once the seat of Etruscan divination.] "And," says the same author, "so far were they carried in to the admiration thereof that they thought in the changeable hitting upon any such verses, great foretokens of their following fortunes were placed, whereupon grew the word of *Sortes Virgilianæ*, when by sudden opening Virgil's book, they lighted upon some verse, as it is reported by many, whereof the histories of the emperor's lives are full. Although it were a very vain and godless superstition; as also

it was to think spirits were commanded by such verses; whereupon this word *charms* derived from *carmina* cometh, so yet serveth to show the great reverence those wits were held in, since both the oracles of Delphos and the Sybil's prophecies were wholly delivered in verses." "One generation [of thoughts] passeth and another cometh." The Nestor of to-day looks upon the very houses which were familiar to his eye in childhood, but the occupants are changed. He has become a stranger in the home of his youth. He has outlived his companions and himself. The advancing age uses a new dialect or gives to the old new significancy. The forms of expression are seen upon the printed page, but strange thoughts dwell in them. The progress of time and events modifies the meaning of the most common terms in our language; and etymology ceases to be a guide in defining them. If a man should date his epistle on Thursday, Jan. 4, Anno Domini 1861, he *literally* recognizes the worship (worth-ship) of the German Thor, the Roman Janus, and the Saviour of lost men. The day and the month were sacred to heathen divinities; the era, from which he dates, announces the birth of the Son of God who came to destroy the works of those very "devils" which the Gentiles worshiped. If a traveler commence his journey (originally a day's march, from *dies*) on Tuesday in the month of March, he may be seeking to propitiate Tuiscos, the guardian god of the old Germans, or Mars, the bloody founder of the Roman state. To avoid such idolatry the Quaker designates the month and the day by numerals, and the very devout Puseyite christens anew the days of the week and the months of the year. The following advertisement of a new prayer book appeared not long since in "The English Ohurchman." "This work will be brought out regularly at F. Gilmour's, High Street, Sarum, every Ascension day (heathenishly called Thursday), and will be in the hands of the London and Oxford booksellers every Passion day, dedicated by all Protestants to the heathen goddess, Friga." Such persons understand the potency of names as well as places in perpetuating a creed. The faithful will often worship the shrine after the god has departed. That sturdy iconoclast, John Knox, advocates the extermination of both. His motto was: "Pull down the nests, and the

rooks will fly away." Destroy the people's reverence for forms of worship and forms of speech, and the Puseyite's occupation is gone. A writer in the *Edinburgh Review* in the number for October, 1853, speaking of this class of mediæval fossils, says: "Who does not recognize when he meets them, in the railway or the street, the clipped shirt collar, the stiff and tieless neckcloth, the M. B. coat and cassock waistcoat, the cropped hair and the unwhiskered cheek? Who does not know that the wearer of this costume will talk of the Holy Altar, and the Blessed Virgin, of Saint Ignatius Loyola, and Saint Alphonso Liguori? And that he will date his letters on the eve of Saint Chad, or the morrow of Saint Martin? Who has not seen the youthful Presbyter bowing to the altar and turning his back to the people? Who has not heard him intoning the prayers and preaching in the surplice on the holy obedience due from the laity to the clergy? * * * * * Who has not noticed the gaudy furniture of his church, the tippeted altar, the candles blazing at noonday, the wreaths of flowers changing their colors with feast or fast, the mediæval emblems embroidered on the altar cloth?"

In church, as in battle, the eyes are first smitten. The Catholics understood this principle and availed themselves of it, to the fullest extent, in the conversion of barbarian nations. They fixed their attention and elicited their interest by magnificent cathedrals with splendid adornings, by gorgeous shows, pomps, and processions. They substituted Christian for heathen festivals, and gave new names to holy days and sacred places. They have not yet succeeded in baptizing anew the days of the week and the names of the months. "Thus," said the venerable Fuller, "we see the whole week bespattered with Saxon idols, whose pagan gods were the godfathers of the days. This same zealot may behold as the object of necessary reformation, designing to have the days of the week new dipt and called after other names. Though indeed this supposed scandal will not offend the wise, as beneath their notice, and cannot offend the ignorant as above their knowledge." Sydney Smith in ridicule of the theological fopperies of the Tractarians used to date his letters on "Washing-day," or "The Eve of Ironing-day." The Romans, after their conversion to Christianity, re-

taining their love of astrology, named each day of the week from the heavenly body which was supposed to rule its first hour. The French still preserve substantially the same names. Sunday, dies solis, also dies Dominicus, or the Lord's day, is *Dimanche*; Monday, dies lunae, *Lundi*; Tuesday, dies Martis, *Mardi*; Wednesday, dies Mercurii, *Mercredi*; Thursday, dies Jovis, *Jeudi*; Friday, dies Veneris, *Vendredi*; Saturday, dies Saturni, *Samedi*. The Babylonians, the inventors of astrology, first designated the days of the week by the names of the heavenly bodies that were supposed to rule them. The Arabs who, also, measured time by weeks, distinguished days by numbers. The Jews gave name to no day but the Sabbath. We, also, have in our language some other traces of Chaldean lore. We speak of a man of Mercurial, Martial, Saturnine, or Jovial temperament, without reviving the worship of the Olympian gods, or assuming that he was born when the planet Mercury, Mars, Saturn, or Jupiter, was in the ascendant. Here mythology, astrology, and philology meet and embrace one another in loving fellowship. We have the temples which different divinities have successively occupied; but new æons are now enshrined in their places. The process by which a secondary meaning gradually steals into the abode of an old thought is happily illustrated by the Latin word "*fastus*," derived probably from the Greek root, φαίω, φημί, Latin, *fari*. Applied as a descriptive epithet to dies, it indicated the right to speak or plead, in the courts, on that day. Its plural "*fasti*" was a calendar or record of festivals, courts, and holydays. With "*ne*" prefixed, "*nefastus*" denoted an inauspicious day, one when business could not be transacted, when the courts were closed. Unlucky days were "*nefasti*." They were unlucky because the gods were angry. Ovid says, speaking of days:

"Ille nefastus erit per quem tria verba silentur,
Fastus erit per quem lege licebit agi."

The three legal terms alluded to, which could not be uttered, on a dies nefastus, were "do," "dico," and "addico." The same epithet, *nefasti*, applied to men, denoted the highest criminality. "*Fatum*" from the same root was originally a simple utterance; used with reference to the gods, an oracle,

lastly, *fate*, which is almost infinitely removed from mere speech. Possibly "*fanum*," a consecrated place, may be from "*fandum*," hence "*pro-fani*" applied to those who stood before the holy place, the uninvited whose bad morals excluded them. As our ideas enlarge, the names we give them, also, expand. All men, in all ages, have gazed upon the same firmament. The Chaldæan shepherd, the Hebrew seer, and the Christian astronomer, have but little in common in their notions of the stars. David's piety was kindled almost into ecstasy when he sang, in matchless strains:—"The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth his handy work." What intensity of meaning has been added to these very words by the discoveries of modern science! To the armed eye of a Newton, a Laplace, or a Hershell, the constellations are not the same objects which the Chaldæan shepherds named or the Hebrew king admired. The names remain, but a new soul dwells in them.

No terms in our language are more familiar to us than "heaven," "earth," and "hell;" but if we seek for the primitive signification of these words, we find it has little affinity with our present definitions of them. Heaven is said to be the perfect participle of the Anglo-Saxon verb "*heaf-an*" or "*heaf-ian*," English to heave, to raise, or elevate. Hence, heaven is something heaved or hoven up. An old writer says:—"The name *heaven*, albeit it was of our ancestors written *heofen*, yet carried it like sense or signification, as now it doth, being as much as to say as *heaven* or *heaved* up, to wit:—The place that is elevated." The rude notion here presented resembles that which is ascribed, by some critics, to the old Hebrews. Their firmament, say they, was an elevated solid expanse, resting on pillars and having windows which were providentially opened to let down the waters that were "above the firmament." Earth is derived by Horne Tooke, from the Gothic "*er-ian*" to eare or plow. It is thought to be the third person singular of that verb which, by a change from "*he eareth*," to "*that which is eared*" or that which one eareth or ploweth, becomes our modern word, *earth*. An old version of I. Cor. ix. 10, reads: "He that erith, owith to ere in hope." Shakespeare makes Richard II. say:

"That power I have, discharge; and let them go
To ear the land, that hath some hope to grow,
For I have none."

The above derivation is analogous to other English words with the same termination: as sloth, that which sloweth; strength, that which stringeth; growth, that which groweth; smith, one that smiteth. So the ordinal numbers are probably formed as "tenth" that which ten-eth, or maketh ten. How unlike was the primitive idea of earth as simply a place of culture or tillage, from the globe we inhabit,—the planet (or wanderer) that annually makes its circuit around the sun. The words, hell, hill, hole, hall, and hull, are said to be from the same root, the Anglo-Saxon "hel-an," German "hullen," to cover or conceal. "Hell is that which is covered over, that is to say, hidden or covered in low obscurity."

The name of a thing includes all the known properties of it, when the name is first imposed. With the progress of knowledge, the original signification becomes so expanded as to lose its identity or entirely disappears and gives place to a successor. When a nation changes its religion, all sacred terms at once assume new force. When the God of Revelation selected the Greek tongue to be the medium of his communications to men, all the words of that language expressive of religious ideas were suddenly regenerated and received new life. The heaven of the Greeks was a concave hemisphere resting on the verge of the earth, with an opening in it through which the peak of Olympus stretched upward into pure ether. *Olympos* was, also, used for Olympus, the seat of the gods and for the welkin or atmosphere in which birds fly. The same word uttered or written by a Christian represented the abode of God and all holy intelligences, a place of unspeakable glory, purity, and bliss. The gods worshiped by the Greeks in their best estate were but little superior to their living heroes. They were subject to like passions and enjoyed the same pleasures. In the darkest phases of their character, they fell below the standard of their best worshipers. In this view, Pope calls them:

"Gods partial, changeful, passionate, unjust,
Whose attributes were rage, revenge, and lust."

The name which they individually bore was adopted by inspired apostles to represent Him who is "of purer eyes than to behold evil," who is said to be both "light" and "love." How completely has the Greek word *θεός* been vacated of its original meaning and filled with the idea of "Him who inhabited eternity!" On the other hand the Greek demons had but little in common with the devils of the Scripture. Some of them were benevolent, some merely passionate, fickle, and restless; others, dark, unpropitious, or positively mischievous. No one of them could with any propriety represent "the tall archangel ruined" of Milton, or the Apollyon of the Revelator. The *κακὸς δαίμων* or evil demon of the tragedians is never the *διάβολος* of the New Testament, the mighty deceiver, the *slanderer* of his brethren, the prince of the kingdom of evil, but rather an avenging angel to doom with curses, or inflict penalties. The word *δαίμων* is often derived from *δαίω*, to divide or to distribute; hence the demons allotted the destinies of men, whether good or bad, and were regarded as benevolent or malevolent according to the portions they brought. The Greeks and Romans both ascribed envy and malignity, at times, to the best of their deities. *Æschylus* says, *εὖ θεῶν φθονεῖν*, the deity is envious. *Juvenal* uses the phrase "malignis numinibus," and says that the jealous gods sometimes overturn whole families at their own request. They grant the prayers of men to their hurt, because they hate them. The names which such divinities bore received new significance when employed by the sacred writers. They were compelled to do service in another station and to be the symbols of other and higher thoughts. The old demons went out of their abode and other spirits more wicked than they entered in and dwelt there. "It is interesting," says an English critic, to watch the transit of the classical into the romantic fable;—to see Jason and Medea reappear as knight and sage princess; to find the fates transformed into demons keeping watch over Proserpine, and to recognize Cerberus in that hideous giant, horrible and high, who guards the melancholy castle of king Pluto. It is yet more so in the high provinces of thought, to trace the transmigration of error or truth into forms familiar to a later eye, and to observe the resumption, as in a new element, of conflicts apparently decided long since." The classic passes into the romantic; from Ro-

man, the first symbol of strength, power, and durability, comes romantic, now the most expressive term for that which is strange, fanciful, and improbable. The change which time has wrought in the word "asylum," is equally striking. It is derived from "a" privative, and *σὺλᾶω*, to draw, indicating that it was unlawful to drag from the altar the man who had sought shelter there from his pursuers. The person who thus sought the sanctuary in the temple was usually a criminal; his heart was laden with guilt and his hands defiled with blood. The design of such a regulation, as under the Mosaic code, was doubtless to protect those who had accidentally committed manslaughter or those who were unjustly accused; but the vilest felons, traitors, and murderers availed themselves of the privilege which religion secured to the innocent. In modern times, guilt does not seek an asylum, but virtuous poverty and hopeless sorrow. The poor, the blind, the halt, and insane are the inmates of Christian asylums. The gospel has converted the very haunts of crime into retreats for the wretched. Here, too, the old temple remains, but a new divinity presides in it. "The poor have the gospel preached unto them."

" The primal duties shine aloft like stars,
The charities that soothe and heal and bless,
Are scattered at the feet of man, like flowers."

Religion itself has a new soul. It was in the Latin tongue (from *re* and *ligo*) a binding again, an attempt to rebind and restrain the natural conscience by such feeble sanctions as their mythology afforded. Religion now performs a higher and holier office. It binds again the lost sinner to "the Father of light, from whom cometh down every good and perfect gift." It begets in the heart a new *allegiance* and attaches the soul in willing homage to the service of the King of kings. Such is the *binding*, the obligation to obedience which the gospel creates. Cicero gives a different etymology to this word. In his treatise "*de Natura Deorum*" he introduces one of the interlocutors in the dialogue, saying: "Those who diligently perused and, as we may say, read or practiced over again all the duties relating to the worship of the gods were called *religiosi*, religious, from *relegendo*, reading over or practicing, as *elegantes ex eligendo*, from choosing or making a good

choice ; *diligentes ex diligendo* from attending to what we love." Whatever may be the origin of the word, it is certain that there is no theme of human discourse, in which the meaning of words so often escapes or yields to a new sense as in religion. Every sect has its shibboleth, its distinctive symbols, and technical terms. All parties employ the language of the Bible, but each attaches a peculiar meaning to its words. Men who differ, *toto cælo*, in their creed, still use the same terms to express their belief. The most "liberal" neologist, who places all religions upon the same level, who classes Plato with Paul as inspired men, nevertheless styles himself a Christian, and employs the language of the Bible to enforce his logic. "Belief," says Mr. Emerson, "consists in accepting the affirmations of the soul; unbelief in denying them." Hence every man's belief is his truth, and belief is "constitutional;" sin is a "defect," but not at all subversive of the sinner's truth or faith. We make our own religion; create our own God, and decide our own destiny. God is the Saxon word "good" and that is only good to each man which he esteems to be so. We may, therefore, take Horne Tooke's theory for our guide. He says: "TRUE, as we now write it, or TREW, as it was formerly written, means simply and merely that which is TROWED. And instead of its being a rare commodity on earth, except only in words, there is nothing but TRUTH in the world. That every man in his communication with others should speak that which he TROWETH is of so great importance to mankind, that it ought not to surprise us if we find the most extravagant and exaggerated praises bestowed upon TRUTH. But truth supposes mankind, for whom and by whom alone the word is formed and to whom alone the word is applicable. If no man, no TRUTH. There is, therefore, no such thing as eternal, immutable, everlasting TRUTH; unless mankind, *such as they are at present*, be, also, eternal, immutable, and everlasting. Two persons may contradict each other and yet both speak the *truth*; for the TRUTH of one person may be opposite to the TRUTH of another. To speak TRUTH may be a vice as well as a virtue; for there are many occasions where it ought not to be spoken." Butler was, therefore, no satirist when he said:

"For breaking an oath and lying
Is but a kind of self-denying."

The same holds true (or, in Tooke's language is trowed or thought by him) of *justice* and *right*. He says: "RIGHT is no other than RECT-um (*regitum*) the past participle of the Latin verb *regere*. Whence in Italian you have *litto*; from *drigere*, DIRITTO, DRITTO; whence the French have their ancient DROIT and their modern DROIT, being no other than the past participle *directum*." *Just*, in the same manner is formed from *jubere*, in the participle *justum*. The etymologies may be correct, but the inferences derived from them are monstrous. Literally interpreted a *right* conduct is that which is regally ordered; "a *just* man is such as he is commanded to be, *qui leges juraque servat*, who observes and obeys the things *laid down* and *commanded*." The law is that which is *laid down*; the right hand is that which by education we are *ordered* to use; and the other is simply *leaved* or *left*. Of course right and justice must vary with the authority which orders and commands. What is *right*, *just*, and *true*, to-day, may be *wrong*, *unjust*, and *false*, to-morrow. Says Mr. Emerson: "That which I call right or goodness is the choice of my constitution; and that which I call heaven, and inwardly aspire after, is the state or circumstance desirable to my constitution." Man is, therefore, not only a law unto himself, but he is his own lawgiver. God, like his works, has an inconstant *nature*, which term, as Coleridge defines it from the Latin "*naturus*," is "that which is about to be born." In this pantheistic sense, God is ever *becoming* or developing into visible creation. He is consequently impersonal or "the ever streaming immanence of the spirit in matter," a mere *anima mundi*, or blind, unconscious, energy like the law of gravitation. Dr. Bushnell in his work entitled "Nature and the Supernatural" borrows the definition of Coleridge. Dr. Hickok in his "Rational Cosmology" adopts it. This idea pervades the reasoning of both authors. Admitting that "*natura*" is derived from "*naturus*," the abstract noun, even in Latin, soon lost all relation to futurity. Instead of denoting the flux and progress of things in process of development, it rather indicated their fixed and permanent constitution. When Cicero says, "*mundum natura administrari*," he doubtless refers to the unchangeable laws of the universe. When Horace, using the word in a moral sense, says,

"*Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret,*" he manifestly refers to the "bent" of our disposition, which now *is*, and is not "about to be" other than it is. To live according to nature, as the old Stoics taught, is to obey her immutable laws. Her teaching, then, is consentaneous with the highest wisdom. Juvenal says, "*Nunquam aliud Natura, aliud Sapientia dicit.*" If God and the Universe are identical, as the pantheists teach, he is, of course, subject to change. He becomes personal and conscious only in man during the brief period of his earthly existence. "All this deep power in which we exist," says Mr. Emerson, "and whose beatitude is all accessible to us, is not only self-sufficing and perfect in every hour, but the act of seeing and the thing seen, the seer and the spectacle, the subject and the object are one." * * "All mind is one." Death, of course, is an absorption into the infinite and absolute. Bliss, as the Vedas also teach, is unconsciousness; hence this "profound thinker" arrives at the startling conclusion that "man, though in brothels or jails, or on gibbets, is on his way to all that is good and true." Such men are called philosophers and reformers! Such jargon, such miserable sophistry, is called wisdom! In the end, sin and holiness, truth and falsehood, God and Nature, are demonstrably identical.

"Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die;" or rather become absorbed in the infinite. If this is not annihilation, it is fearfully like it. Cicero, speaking of this same doctrine which seems so new to us when presented in an English dress, says: "Pythagoras, who supposed the deity to be one soul mixing with and pervading all nature, from which our souls are taken, did not consider that the Deity himself must be maimed and torn by the rending of every human soul from him; nor, that when the human mind is afflicted (as it often is), part of the Deity must likewise be afflicted, which cannot be. If the human mind were a god, how could it be ignorant of any thing?" In reply to this question, it is sufficient to say that the minds of modern sages do assume to know everything; and whoever cannot see over them must admit, that to him they are infinite. You ask the modern Sir Oracle; was Jesus sent from God? Yes; he had a mission like that of Zoroaster

or Confucius. Did he speak from divine inspiration? Yes: all genius is inspired. "It is a scintillation of the Infinite, a beam of the universal mind." Homer, Milton, and Shakespeare were inspired to sing; Socrates and Plato to teach; Newton and Laplace to investigate; Washington and Tell to vindicate liberty. Here is an apotheosis of genius and power which will justify the Chinaman in paying divine honors to his ancestors; the Greek, in worshipping his benefactor; the Catholic in praying to his saint. Why not? If God be honored in all his parts, are not the parts equal to the whole? The philosopher may worship himself with reason; for he knows no higher God than that which is manifested in his own consciousness. Coleridge tells us of one who so revered his own being that he never spoke of himself without taking off his hat. He stood "discovered" (as the old English hath it) in the presence of his God. The pantheist eschews prayer; because he knows that "mens' prayers are a disease of the will." Language and opinions, words and thought act reciprocally upon each other. The philosopher's views are always more or less modified by his method of research and his modes of expression. The theologian's creed is greatly confirmed or invalidated by the technical terms he employs. Rigid formulæ, like breaks upon the moving train, arrest progress. False or inadequate definitions lead into positive errors. An ardent polemic is often perverted by his own logic; so a wily advocate frequently becomes the dupe of his own rhetoric. They both believe what they wish to believe; and, the greater their ability to reason and persuade, the more fatal their influence upon themselves and others. Partisans and sectarians always have their battle cries, and that man, who has the skill to originate them, must be a leader. In the first war with England, our fathers fought under banners bearing this motto: "Taxation and representation inseparable." In the second war with the same nation, our war cry was: "Free-trade and sailors' rights." In the recent civil war, which has brought sorrow to every hearth-stone in the land, three very significant and potent countersigns for the defenders of the Government and the Constitution were furnished by a single "representative man," to wit: "The higher law;" "No more compro

mises ;" and "the irrepressible conflict." These phrases have stirred the public mind quite as much as the pulpit and the press. The true partisan not only "flouts the sky" with his banners, but he uses the dialect of his party, wears the emblems of his faith upon his person, and exhibits them in his dwelling. It is often easy to determine a man's religious or political status, by observing the ornaments he wears, the books that lie upon his centre-table, or the pictures that adorn his parlor walls. The different nationalities that compose our great republic keep up their distinctive organizations by the names which they affix to their books, their journals, and their churches. A daily Gazette, with an "Irish," "Celtic," "French," or "German" prefix, is a perpetual promoter of national animosities, and an effectual estoppel to the Americanization of our foreign population. The same holds true of religious sects. Where religious books and newspapers are labeled "Episcopalian," "Presbyterian," "Congregational," "Methodist," or "Baptist," the readers of them are constantly reminded of their allegiance to their creed and church. Etymologies and the "*usus loquendi*" of different ages are frequently employed to give additional force to sectarian appellations ; but classical usage, New Testament usage, and English usage, are very diverse standards. The theology (*θεολογία*) of Plato differs essentially from that of Paul or Parker. The *ἐκκλησία* of Thucydides fails to aid the exegete in the interpretation of the *ἐκκλησία* of the New Testament. A new meaning flows into these words from the pen of inspiration. We infer, therefore, that classical usage in respect to *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, furnishes rather presumptive than demonstrative evidence of their true import. Etymology and ancient use make our bishops, overseers ; our presbyters, elders ; our clergy, mere clerks, our priests (*præ* and *sto*) ministers of the altar. From such sources, we gain but little aid in interpreting such significant phrases as "the grace of God ;" "the cross of Christ ;" "justification by faith ;" and "the sanctification of the Spirit." Here, Scripture usage is our only authority. The same difficulty occurs in defining some very common phrases and words in our own language. We talk now of giving to a convict "the benefit of the clergy." Most men

think that spiritual consolation instead of a pardon is intended. When few men could read and write, a "learned clerk," who had forfeited his life by crime, was pardoned, because of his accomplishments. This was styled "the benefit of the clergy." Blackstone informs us that "the King's Exchequer" was so named from the *checked* cloth that covered the table behind which the money-changers sat. The odious "Court of the star chamber," which was so oppressive under the Tudors, was so named because the ceiling of the room, where the inquisitors sat, was dotted with *stars* by the painter's brush. Gibbon tells us that "Paddy" or "Patrick," a very common appellation of the Irish, is identical with the old Roman "patricius," patrician, from "pater," a senator. "What a fall was there, my countrymen!" The very ink with which we write boasts a remarkable genealogy. It was not at first black but purple, as used by the court of the Byzantine emperors. Says De Vere: "Both the color and the gold with which the manuscripts were embellished were burnt in, hence the names of *ἐγκαυστικόν* and encaustic." The process was not unknown to the Romans, for Ovid (in *Fastis*) speaks of it; the *Codex Argenteus* is, also, probably encaustic. The latter technical term has furnished "inchiostro" to Italy, "encre" to France, and "ink" to England. The German "tinte" is commonly derived from "tingere." Sir Thomas More was, perhaps, the most illustrious of English martyrs who died for their religious opinions. He was a sincere Catholic. What is it to be *sincere*? This word is derived from the practice of filling flaws in articles of furniture with wax to hide their defects. Hence "*sine cera*," *without wax*, indicated superior excellence; used in a moral sense, it denoted purity and integrity. Trace the word "catholic" to its elements, *κατά* and *ὅλος*, and observe its *general* meaning. The latter element may be connected by regular descent, with our word "*whole*," which etymologically is holiness. When the Saviour said, "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect," he doubtless referred to completeness of character, such as was shadowed forth by the Roman phrase, "*Totus, teres, et rotundus*." Sir Thomas More, the martyr (or witness to what he

trowed or thought) gave us an ideal of a perfect commonwealth, like that of Plato, and called it Utopia. From this came *utopian*, an epithet which, like Quixotic, from the Spanish, has often proved a more effective weapon than argument, when wielded by conservatives and Tories against innovators and democrats. If the public can be made to believe that a reformer is utopian or quixotic in his plans, his occupation is gone. Either of these adjectives, associated in the people's minds with any measure, however beneficent, is as fatal to it as the poisonous sting of the American "hum-bug." Sir Thomas More lost his head for asserting the real presence in the Eucharist, and maintaining that the priest spoke the truth when he said, "*hoc est corpus*," which words our conjurors have profanely converted into *hocus-pocus*. Mr. Marsh, in his "Lectures on the English Language," gives us a delightful biography of the little word "*grain*," as used by Milton, in the following quotation :

"Come pensive Nun, devout and pure,
Sober, steadfast, and demure,
All in robe of darkest *grain*,
Flowing with majestic train."

Grain here means purple. It is derived from the Latin "*granum*," a seed or kernel, which was applied to a little insect of the genus *coccus*, having a seed-like form, and found on a species of oak, the "*quercus coccifera*" of the botanists, on all the Mediterranean coasts. This little insect, *coccum* or *granum*, yields a beautiful purple dye, called in commerce, *kermes*. It is said that the city and territory of Granada received its name from the abundance of *grain* or *coccum* gathered there.

Mr. Marsh adds : "Kermes, which I have used as a synonym of grana or *grain*, is the Arabic and Persian name of the *coccus* insect, and the word occurs in a still older form, *krmi*, in Sanscrit. From this root are derived the words *carmine* and *crimson*, common to all the European languages. The Roman sometimes applied to the *coccus* the generic name, *vermiculus*, a little worm or insect. *Vermiculus* is the diminutive of *vermis*, which is doubtless cognate with the Sanscrit *krmi*, as is also the English word *worm*. From *vermiculus*

comes vermillion, the name of an allied color, erroneously supposed to be produced by the kermes, though in fact of a different origin, and, I may add, that *cochineal*, as the name both of a dye which has now almost wholly superseded the European *grain*, and of the American insect which produced it, is derived through the Spanish, from *coccum*, the Latin name of the Spanish insect." Hence, *to dye in grain*, originally meant to dye with kermes, to dye purple or crimson; then, to dye with fast colors, lastly to dye in the raw material. Truly, the history of a word is often worth more than the history of a campaign. This is true of many despised and misused terms in our language. The Anglo-Saxon element is by far the most forcible and expressive portion of the English tongue; but many of the words which are most significant are vulgar; and why? Simply because the nobility, who accompanied William the Conqueror, spoke French, and gave tone to polite discourse. The rude speech of the subjugated peasants was associated with their servile condition. Their words, like themselves, were made to perform all kinds of menial service. The very names which designated their employments became ignoble and mean: *knave* was once a lad or child; *villain* a peasant, belonging to the villa or gentleman's country seat; *varlet*, a serving man; *boor*, a farmer; and *churl*, a strong fellow. *Imp* was originally a term of dignity. Shakespeare, in "Love's Labor lost," says:

"Sadness is one and the self-same thing, dear imp."

Ancient Pistol shouts at the coronation of Henry V.:

"The heavens thee guard and keep, most royal imp of fame."

Lord Cromwell in a letter to Henry VIII. speaks of Prince Edward as that godlike imp, and prays that he may long reign. He is, also, called by Churchyard, "impe of Grace." An amusing use of the same word occurs in old Bacon's "Pathway to Prayer." He says: "Let us pray for the preservation of the king's most excellent majesty, and for the prosperous success of his entirely beloved son Edward, our Prince, that most angelic imp." Other more fitting designations of royalty have fallen from their high estate, and are now the appellations of the million. Herr, Don, Signior, Seig-

neur, and Sennor, were once titles of kings. Seigneur has passed into Sieur, Sire, and Sir. Monseigneur has become monsieur; and master is changed to mister. Dame, now often a word of contempt, was once applied only to high born ladies. Madame, my-dame, abridged from mea domina, in the Latin, has sunk into ma'am, mam, and mum. So oriental prostration in token of homage has, with occidental rustics, been abbreviated into a bow and a backward sweep of the foot; hence the phrase, "to scrape an acquaintance."

"Bowling and scraping" show the stranger to be *polite*, which epithet, two centuries ago, was as often applied to the *mirror* as to him who looked into it to behold

"The glass of fashion and the mould of form."

The moral and intellectual character of a people, as well as their thoughts and habits, are clearly exhibited in their language. The shameless mendacity of the Chinese is revealed in their fulsome compliments, in the pompous style in which they describe things insignificant, and the habitual use of superlatives in the expression of simple emotions. Boasters are never truthful or trustworthy. Landor charges the Italians with a like depravity from the extravagance of their speech. To quote only a single instance, they speak of taking life by poison as a mode of facilitating death, and call it "ajutare la morte." Such corruption of morals may be found wrought into the very texture of all languages, both ancient and modern.

Juvenal indignantly scourges the polished Romans for relieving the consciences of rich criminals by softening the names of their crimes. Their base servility to the vilest of their emperors, and their courtly flatteries constantly lavished upon them, he satirizes with unsparing severity. They carried their hypocrisy from the court to the temple, and uttered their very prayers with mental reservations. High and holy themes exalt a language. Great thoughts call for a pure speech. Mr. Marsh has the following beautiful comment upon the style of the Apostles: "We regard the Hebrew-Greek diction of the New Testament as eminently plain and simple; and so, indeed, it is, as compared with the general dialect of Greek

literature; but what a richness of vocabulary does it display with respect to all that concerns the moral, the spiritual, and even the intellectual interests of humanity! What a range of abstract thought, what an armory of dialectic weapons, what an enginery of vocal implements for operating on the human soul, do the Epistles of the learned Paul exhibit! The gospel of the unschooled John throws forward most conspicuously another phase of language; for, as Paul appeals to the moral, through the intellectual faculties, John, on the other hand, finds his way to the head, by the channel of the heart, and his diction is of course in great part composed of the words which describe or excite the sensibilities, the better sympathies of our nature. Now the respective dialects of these two apostles could have existed only as the result of a long course of mental and religious training in the races who used the speech employed by them; and where such training has not been enjoyed, there no such vocabulary can be developed, and of course no such doctrine expressed."

The Jewish mind was admirably trained by previous discipline for the appreciation of divine truth. Had the inspired apostles been selected from any other nation on the earth, they could not, without a miracle, have understood the revelations of the new dispensation; nor could they have imparted to any spoken language the new spiritual vitality breathed into the words which the Holy Ghost used. The study of a language is the study of the mind, heart, and life of the people who use it. In this view words are things, and the objective contemplation of them is eminently practical and useful. A thorough knowledge of the primitives and derivatives, of their grammatical inflections and modifications, is as necessary to the historian and psychologist as to the grammarian and philologist. Where history is dumb, language often speaks. The discovery of the human foot-print on the sand did not more certainly prove to the solitary islander the existence of a brother man, than the similarity of inflections in the speech of different lands proves the brotherhood of nations. Etymology must always be an essential branch of a liberal education, and where written records fail, comparative philology must indicate the march of nations. True, these sciences have

often been perverted by fanciful theorists ; and national affinities have been sometimes inferred from similarity of sound or the existence of a letter or two in common in a few words of different languages. With reference to such speculations we may say, in the words of an old writer, "The judicious behold these as no regular congruities but casual coincidences, the like to which may be found in languages of the greatest distance, which never met together since they parted at the confusion of Babel ; and we may not enforce a conformity between the Hebrew and the English because one of the three giants, sons of Anak, was called A-hi-man." However, the strange metamorphoses which words undergo, in the lapse of time, almost justify the wild etymologies of erudite Germans. The word γάλα, in Greek, means *milk*. From it we derive the words, galaxy, and lettuce. *Lac*, in Latin, is the lineal descendant of γάλα, Gen. γάλακτος ; from "*lac*," comes "*lactuca*," lettuce, a milky plant. The word *saunterer*, in English, would hardly suggest to us the idea of a pilgrim visiting la Sainte Terre. The name was debased by the idlers who bore it ; as those who devoted all their time to the study of the works of the "Angelic Doctor," Duns Scotus, very properly inherited the name of *dunces*. France owes its name to the Franks, who conquered her native Celts. This word is usually supposed to indicate a nation of freemen. "It is derived," says Klipstein, "either from the Tentonic 'franho,' *bold*, *frank*, in the sense of *fierce* or *ferocious*, or from 'franca,' a sort of sharp, double-edged battle-axe, peculiar to that people, which they hurled, with great dexterity, in attacking their enemies." From this national appellation we have that blood-bought privilege, *franchise* and *enfranchisement*. The German Franks conquered the Roman Gauls. The Frank, though a heathen, was a conqueror, a *Gentile* ; and this last epithet, with the conquered race, passed into *gentil-homme*, and, crossing the channel, became *gentleman*. The conquering Frank long remembered the toil it cost him to cross the Roman ramparts. The *vallum* surrounded every fortified town and every encampment of the Gauls. To get *trans vallum* was his hardest labor ; so from analogy he came to denominate any uncommon effort *travail*. The Normans carried this

word into England ; and as a journey to a foreign country was both toilsome and perilous, the English called it *travel* and *traveling*. Thus we see that the shades of meaning which mark the different periods in the history of words, can only be detected by studying carefully the chronological history of the language. The primitive meaning is often the most remote from present use ; still, that branch of philology which treats of the origin of words, possesses great historical value. As a medium of proof for creeds, it is fallacious ; as a mental discipline, it is profitable ; as a source of information, it is useful ; as a learned diversion, it is amusing. But it is exceedingly hazzardous to attempt to decide a theological controversy, or found a historical theory, upon mere etymologies. Nowhere is this more evident than in the names of popular factions. The aggressive party always assumes an honorable appellation ; their antagonists always strive to degrade them by ignominious soubriquets.

Success makes even the reproachful and abusive names reputable. Puritans and Methodists hold an exalted position in history, and Whig and Tory are now the legitimate designations of English political parties. With the progress of civilization virtue becomes more lovely, and vice more odious. "*Virtus*," from *vir*, originally indicated manly energy ; "*vitium*" was simply injury or hurt, and was used to describe a flaw in a vessel, or a cleft in the wall of a house. In the infancy of society, the bravest man was the best ; hence linguists associate ἄρης, the god of war, with ἄριστος, which expresses superlative goodness. Mere physical prowess finally becomes synonymous with the highest moral worth. The names ἀρετή and *virtus* remain, but purer spirits are enshrined in them. From this desultory discussion, we learn that verbal controversies are unprofitable. They can never be decided. They engender bitter strifes between wise and good men, from a mutual misapprehension of the terms used in argument. "No one," says Humboldt, "assigns precisely the same meaning to a word that another does ; and a shade of meaning, be it ever so slight, ripples on like a circle in the water through the eternity of languages." It is not probable that any two polemics ever entertain exactly the same notions of the tech-

nical terms they use. No two Christians have identically the same views of God, Heaven, and Hell; or of their duties and obligations. Their thoughts expand with increased intelligence and holiness. The brighter the light of the natural sun, the more manifest become the imperfections of natural objects. The nearer we approach the sun of righteousness, the clearer are our views of his exalted purity, and of our own sinfulness.

The old philosopher Hobbes has some good thoughts on the proper use of language in controversies. He observes, "The equivocal use of names makes it often difficult to recover those conceptions for which they were designed, not only in the language of others, wherein we are to consider the drift, and occasion, and contexture of the speech, as well as the words themselves; but in our discourse which, being derived from the custom and common use of speech, representeth unto us not our own conceptions. It is, therefore, a great ability in a man, out of the words, contexture, and other circumstances of language, to deliver himself from equivocation, and to find out the true meaning of what is said; and this is it we call understanding. True and false are attributes of speech, not of things; where speech is not, there is neither truth nor falsehood, though there may be error. Hence, as truth consists in the right ordering of names in our affirmation, a man that seeks precise truth hath need to remember what every word he uses stands for, and place it accordingly. In geometry, men begin by definitions. And every man who aspires to true knowledge should examine the definitions of former authors, and either correct them or make them anew. In the right definition of names lies the first use of speech, which is the acquisition of science. And in wrong, or no definitions, lies the first abuse from which proceed all false and senseless tenets which make these men that take their instruction from the authority of books, and not from their own meditation, to be as much below the condition of ignorant men as those endued with true science are above it. Words are wise men's counters: they do but reckon by them; but they are the money of fools."

ARTICLE II.—DIVORCE LEGISLATION IN CONNECTICUT.

Is Christian marriage recognized and protected by the laws of Connecticut?

There are two rival theories in regard to the ultimate foundation and authority both of the family and the State. According to one of them, these relations have been instituted of God; and government and authority, whether in the one or the other, rest, at last, in the government and authority of God. According to the other, the relations of the family and of the State are not instituted at all, but created by the voluntary action of the parties who constitute them; and the family and the State are resolved at last into contracts for cohabitation, and for mutual protection. The first is the Christian theory. According to it the family is a divine institution, the unit and foundation of all society, and of course of the State. The individual is immortal, and to be defended in the exercise of certain rights as a subject of the government of God. The relations of the family and of government are regarded as practically indissoluble. Their dissolution, at least, is justified only as revolution is justified, as a last and extreme resort. The latter is the socialist or infidel theory, according to which these relations depend for their continuance solely on the mutual pleasure of the parties themselves, and can be terminated therefore at their will: and the doctrines of secession and divorce, *ad libitum*, quite legitimately follow. This infidel theory of the State received, unfortunately, a certain degree of recognition at the original constitution of our government; but the horror excited by its practical consequences has at last aroused the people to cast it out, and to restore the theory of a divine authority of government in its stead. The moment is a favorable one in which to ask whether there are not other vestiges of this same infidel doctrine which also need to be cast out; whether a doctrine which is destructive of the family is not equally dangerous with one which renders gov-

ernment impossible. In an edifice the foundation is surely of equal importance with the superstructure. The Christian idea of the family proceeds entirely upon the permanence of the relationship, as a relationship between a husband and one wife. This was evidently the original idea of God at the beginning—an idea which was obscured in its purity by the Jewish custom of permitting divorce even on the part of the husband, and still more by the possession of more wives than one; but restored again in its integrity in the precept of Christ. This fundamental idea of the family is of course completely set aside and destroyed when the principle of indiscriminate divorce, on the part both of the husband and the wife, is admitted as of equal validity by its side. Christian society can undoubtedly exist, for it has existed and grown to strength even in the midst of a corrupt pagan civilization; but the permanent safety of a Christian State can be found only in obedience to the principles of Christianity.

The precepts of Christ, on the subject of divorce, as expounded by the Apostles, found application, at first, only within the limits of the believers themselves. Even after Christianity had gained possession of the State a certain reference was had to existing usages in the laws of the first Christian emperors, and it is undoubtedly true that in these early enactments a very broad interpretation was given to the language of Christ in the enumeration of the grounds of divorce. In the gradual development, however, of the theory of the sacramental character of marriage, both its solemnization and dissolution fell exclusively into the hands of the clergy, and were administered according to the prescriptions of the Canon Law. This continued to be the case in England even after the Reformation, and until within a very few years of the present time. According to Ecclesiastical Law marriage might be annulled, or rather shown never to have existed, for any cause which rendered one of the parties incapable of entering it; but where real marriage had once been entered into by parties properly capable of marriage, it could not be dissolved even for adultery, though a special dispensation for a separation, *a mensa et thoro*, might be obtained. In Scotland the right of a complete divorce for adultery dates nearly from the

Reformation, and was still further enlarged in 1573, by the addition of malicious desertion for four years, while in England the severity of the Canon Law was mitigated only by private acts of Parliament, obtainable by the wealthy alone.

The earliest legislation on the subject in the colonies, of which we have any record, is that contained in the biblical digest, which answered the purpose of a legal code in the colony of New Haven, and was first published in 1656. It assigns both desertion and adultery as valid grounds of divorce, and in providing for divorce for desertion, reference is specially made in the body of the enactment to the passage 1 Cor. vii., 15, as the biblical authority. There was added to this, in 1663, a provision for divorce after seven years' absence of one of the parties, as presumptive of death. The same provisions substantially are found embodied in a law passed after the union of the two colonies of New Haven and Connecticut in 1677. The language of this law is that "a divorce may be granted in cases of adultery, fraudulent contract, willful desertion for three years, and seven years providential absence, being not heard of after due enquiry made and certified, such party shall be counted legally dead to the other party; in all which cases a bill of divorce may be granted by the Court of Assistants to the aggrieved party, who may then lawfully marry or be married to any other." In the reconstruction of the Judiciary, in 1711, the jurisdiction was transferred to the Superior Court.

This original legislation on the subject of divorce remained without change during the entire colonial history, and indeed after the adoption of the present Constitution, for a period of nearly two hundred years. It would not be easy now to trace definitely the impulse under which the Colonial Legislation departed so broadly from that of the mother country, though here it may be said that the Legislation of England is an exception to that generally adopted in countries to which the influence of the Reformation extended, and is doubtless to be attributed to the Episcopal character retained in its Ecclesiastical Constitution. The great body of the Reformers entertained views which were liberal in contrast with the strictness of the Canon Law, and these views found embodiment in the legislation of many Protestant States. Even in England a com-

mission appointed by Edward the Sixth, with Cranmer and Peter Martyr at its head, drafted an enactment providing for divorce, not only "for adultery or desertion, * * * but likewise for evil and fierce usage," which only the accession of Mary prevented from becoming a law.

In 1643 Milton published his famous *Doctrine and Discipline of Divorce*, followed by an exposition of Scripture, and a Rejoinder—a very learned and eloquent discussion of the whole subject, full of references to Ecclesiastical History, and of citations from the Fathers and the Reformers, and constituting a complete Thesaurus of opinions in the interpretation of the leading biblical texts. These writings of Milton present an able argument as opposed to the Ecclesiastical practice of England, but they furnish no practical principle of limitation in the application of the principles advanced, and would open wide the door for the loosest legislation possible, surpassing in laxity even the special dispensations of the Mosaic Code. They had no effect upon English Legislation, nor is it easy to trace any direct influence in this country.

The reaction from the sacramental theory of marriage in the Canon Law, which led the Puritans at first to limit the solemnization of marriage to the civil magistrates, sufficiently accounts for a legislation which was thought liberal at the time, but is Puritan severity when compared with the laxity of our present laws. Even this legislation, however, which admitted only desertion, in addition to adultery, as a cause for divorce, was not without strong and decided remonstrances, of which the most noteworthy is that by Dr. Benjamin Trumbull, in a sermon at North Haven in 1785, published with an appendix in 1788, as an "Appeal to the Public on the unlawfulness of Divorce, except for adultery." This "Appeal," which took its rise in a case of discipline in the Church at North Haven, with scarcely less learning than that employed by Milton, argues for an opposite conclusion. Its thoroughly just criticism of the *ex parte* hearings, loose evidence, and looser decisions, under the stricter Colonial Law in the Courts of 1786, would derive additional force in reference to these same characteristics, under still looser laws in the Courts of 1866. "The custom," says Dr. Trumbull, "respecting divorces is contrary to the law and

practice in other cases of far less importance. In the affair of the distribution and settlement of insolvent estates the matter must be publicly notified six, ten, or eighteen months before a creditor can be debarred from bringing in and recovering a debt even of five shillings. In the case of absent and absconding debtors, provision is also made that agents shall answer for them, and that beside leaving citations at their last place of abode, the Court shall be adjourned from time to time that the attorney, factor, or agent may have opportunity to notify his principal. Is it not admirable that when the law makes such provision for the security of property of the least amount, no such provision shall be made to prevent the ruin of whole families, and to guard the most essential interests and bonds of human society! Is not this a defect which calls upon the Legislature for an immediate remedy? Ought the husband and wife to be more easily separated than the creditor may obtain the most familiar cause, or be thrown out of a shilling? I am persuaded that in this matter the law and usage of Connecticut have not a parallel upon earth." (p. 41.) The number of divorces annually granted in the State at this time, according to Dr. Trumbull, exceeded twenty, doubtless increased somewhat at the particular time at which he wrote by the events through which the Colonies had just passed in the war of the Revolution. Later, Dr. Dwight preached a somewhat noted sermon, taking strong ground against all divorce, save for the cause of adultery, and in a repetition of the discourse before the Governor and a great part of the Legislature just before his death, in 1816, furnished some facts which would show the number of divorces granted annually in the State at that time to have been as high as forty.

During this whole period of two hundred years which we have been considering, legislation was nearly uniform, and decrees of divorce were confined substantially to two causes, adultery and desertion.

We now come to a period of twenty years just passed, during which there have been rapid and considerable changes in the law and in the statistics of divorce. Previous to the year 1843 the whole number of divorces bore but a very small proportion to the entire population of the State; but after the insertion

in the law of that year of two additional causes for divorce, "habitual intemperance" and "intolerable cruelty," we find the decrees of divorce multiplying in a perceptibly increasing ratio. Conjugal restlessness and discontent, however, instead of being allayed, seem only to have been further stimulated by the increased facilities afforded for dissolving the relationship. The number of suits which could not be entertained, or at least could not be granted by the courts even with their enlarged jurisdiction, and which therefore were presented to the Legislature for their action, became so considerable and were prosecuted often with so much earnestness as greatly to engross the time and attention of that body, and at the session of 1848 a motion was made still further to increase the powers of the courts, and the causes for which divorces might be granted by them, and by a law which received final force in 1849, there were added to the previous causes of divorce "imprisonment for life" or "infamous crime," involving as punishment imprisonment for a shorter period, and "any such misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner and defeats the purposes of the marriage relation."

Two influences seem to have been active in securing this last change in the Legislation of our State on this subject. One proceeding from the apparent harshness of the strictly technical and legal construction of the term "intolerable cruelty" in the law of 1843, which in a somewhat noted case (*Shaw vs. Shaw*) was held to be confined to physical inflictions hazardous to life itself, but mainly from a strong desire on the part of the Legislature to rid itself of troublesome applications by a reference of the whole matter, with ampler powers, to the Superior Courts.

It requires but a moment's attention to perceive that the law of 1849 not merely extends the range of the causes of divorce, but introduces an entirely new principle and method of procedure in the dissolution of the marriage relation. Previous to this time the law, beside declaring a marriage void from fraudulent contract, and determining what evidence should be received as proof of the death of one of the parties, had contented itself with alleging certain distinct and definite crimes, capable in each case of definite legal proof, as grounds for the

dissolution of the relationship. Now, however, in language so general and vague, and wholly unknown to any jurisprudence, whether civil or criminal, as to be utterly incapable of *any* definite legal construction, marriage was declared dissoluble by "any such misconduct as permanently destroys the happiness of the petitioner, or defeats the purposes of the marriage relation." No rules of evidence are provided for determining whether these conditions are fulfilled, nor are the purposes of the marriage relation more particularly defined. It is evident that the widest door possible was opened, both in the character of the evidence which might be admitted, and in the latitude of discretion allowed the judge in his ultimate decision. With the license of this enactment it will not surprise us to find the number of divorces granted by the Courts rapidly increasing. During the same year, though but little more than six months of it remained, 91 were granted. In 1850, 129; in 1851, 165; the number increasing with startling rapidity, until in 1864, 434 were granted, nearly five times as many as in 1849, though the population of the State had increased only from 370,000 in 1850, to an estimated population of 490,000 in 1864.

A table is subjoined showing the increase in the number of divorces throughout the State by counties:—

	Hartford County.	New Haven County.	N. London County.	Fairfield County.	Litchfield County.	Windham County.	Middlesex County.	Tolland County.	Total.	By 4 years periods.
1849	21	8	14	11	23	10	0	4	91	
1850	27	30	9	16	18	10	0	19	129	
1851	30	29	24	20	33	12	5	12	165	
1852	26	36	30	22	16	9	5	15	159	544
1853	48	39	28	22	21	18	7	3	186	
1854	31	44	38	32	26	23	3	14	216	
1855	37	46	21	35	33	19	7	10	208	
1856	34	47	34	42	18	19	9	12	215	825
1857	38	40	37	43	19	28	9	18	232	
1858	50	47	40	44	25	23	8	19	256	
1859	50	61	47	50	28	30	10	23	299	
1860	35	63	58	36	32	29	9	20	282	1069
1861	53	57	35	35	36	29	10	17	272	
1862	65	50	34	35	30	19	8	17	258	
1863	75	58	53	36	24	19	7	17	289	
1864	97	121	56	44	46	35	14	21	434	1253
	417	776	553	523	428	337	111	241	3691	
1865		18	12	11	5	14	3	1	54	
		794	570	534	433	351	114	242	3745	

A glance at this table reveals to us the fact that during a period of fifteen years nearly 4,000 divorces have been granted ; a number equal to one-twentieth of all the families in the State. Are we not justified in the conclusion that the law of 1849 effected not merely a change, but a revolution in the legislation of the State in the matter of divorce ! How then has this revolution been accomplished ? If we turn again to the terms of that law we find that three new causes of divorce were added by it—imprisonment for life, infamous crime, and general misconduct. Applications for divorce, for the two first of these causes, occur but seldom in the records of the Courts, and cannot, from the nature of the case, have affected materially the whole number granted. It is to the third cause, therefore, that we must look for the multiplication five-fold of the decrees of divorce by our Courts, and yet by reference to a classified table subjoined,*

	Hartford Co.	New Haven Co.	New London Co.	Fairfield Co.	Litchfield Co.	Windham Co.	Middlesex Co.	Tolland Co.		
Husband petitioner, Wife petitioner,	48 54	39 100	22 46	15 40	22 29	18 31	1 16	9 18	169 329	About one-half. 498
INTERVAL BETWEEN MAR- RIAGE AND PETITION.										
Less than one year,	10	9	9	1	2	3	0	0	34	Less than six years, 192. Over six years, 306.
Over 1 and less than 2 years,	8	11	3	5	5	3	0	2	37	
Over 2 " " " 8 "	10	8	3	4	1	5	0	1	32	
Over 3 " " " 6 "	16	28	17	7	6	10	2	3	89	
Over 6 " " " 10 "	18	41	12	6	16	11	4	5	112	
Over 10 years	35	43	24	32	21	17	11	11	194	
Alimony demanded, Respondent appeared,	1 3	5 16	6 7	3 3	5 2	5 6	4 0	3 7	32 44	About 1-11 of whole.
CAUSES.										
Adultery,	21	39	17	18	18	17	0	0	130	Little less than $\frac{1}{2}$; more than $\frac{1}{2}$.
Desertion, without adultery.	54	42	18	15	18	12	7	3	169	
Cruelty, without adultery or desertion,	14	25	16	9	8	9	8	0	89	Just 1-6 of whole. About $\frac{1}{2}$ of whole.
Intemperance, without adul- tery or desertion,	5	19	13	7	5	7	0	14	70	
General misconduct, simplv,	11	15	16	11	10	9	6	5	83	
Intemperance, with or without other grounds,	25	32	21	15	13	11	6	5	128	

in which the decrees of divorce for the year 1864, and two months of 1865, are given in connection with their causes, it appears that only one-sixth of the whole were granted expressly for general misconduct alone. It is, indeed, exceedingly curious to notice the effect which this so-called general misconduct clause has had upon the construction of the entire enactment, of which it forms apparently so subordinate a part. It is noticed sometimes in musical instruments that an attachment directly connected with but a portion of the scale, and designed primarily to affect but the notes of a single octave, is found in practice to give a new tone and character to the whole instrument throughout its entire range. Something analogous to this would seem to have been the effect of this general misconduct attachment to our divorce law. Its influence has been felt not only in the suits brought specifically in its name, but in extending the loose, vague, and indefinite character of its own terms over the language and administration of the entire enactment. In addition to the tables carefully prepared for that purpose it may not be improper to introduce in this connection other parts of the evidence laid before the special committee appointed by the Legislature of 1865 to take into consideration, and report upon the recommendation of the Governor, in relation to a reform in our Laws of Divorce. In the evidence presented to that committee, from which are drawn almost all the facts quoted in this Article in regard to the present administration of our divorce law, was the opinion of two of our judges who have recently retired from the bench, that of the 4,000 divorces granted in this State during the past fifteen years, more than half have been secured through the influence, direct or indirect, of this general misconduct clause.

In a vast number of cases, in which the evidence in reference to the particular offense alleged in the suit must have been rejected as insufficient, the additional claim urged by counsel, that "the happiness of the petitioner had been destroyed, and the end of the marriage relation defeated," has been sufficient to secure a decree of divorce. In fact it may be said that the indirect influence of this clause has been far greater than any it could independently have secured; and where upon this issue alone a decree could not have been obtained, yet, coupled with the charge of adultery, though amounting to only

a suspicion—or with desertion for a shorter period than provided for in the statute; or with evidence of intemperance and cruelty, which would be held wholly insufficient in itself as a ground of divorce—this plea of general misconduct has, in innumerable instances, been pressed to an actual decree. Indeed, when we consider the indefinite terms of this provision, it is difficult to set any limit to the amount of pressure which may be brought, by interested friends, to bear upon the mind even of the most conscientious judge, to induce a dissolution of the relationship. The whole matter is, in effect, placed under his almost absolute discretion; and where the State has entrusted such almost unlimited power over the most sacred relation of life, with few and slight limitations or barriers of any kind to preserve it from abuse, it need not surprise us to find at least equal laxity in its practical exercise. Apart, however, from the loose language of the statute, and the large discretion allowed to the judge, it would be difficult to conceive of anything called a Court, constituted with more inevitable tendency to dangerous laxity of practice than the Superior Court extemporized, during the few minutes just before or after one of its ordinary sessions, into a Court of Divorce.

But whatever may be said of the constitution of the Court, its usages are certainly such as are known to no other Court, civil or criminal, high or low, within the jurisdiction of the State. Not only is it true in nine cases out of ten, or more exactly, as our second table shows, in ten cases out of eleven, that there is no appearance whatever for the respondent, and consequently all the evidence presented is *ex parte*, but it is a notorious fact that, ordinarily, no sufficient measures are complied with to secure notice to the respondent. It is true the law provides that certain parties may issue an order of notice, but what the order shall be, and what the evidence of its service, are left again to the discretion of the officer who issues it, and practically the duty is fulfilled, as shown in the evidence before the committee, by the discharge of a letter through the post-office to the last address which the petitioner who brings the suit may choose to furnish.

Whether, in the etiquette of a Court of Divorce, it be considered discourteous or otherwise, to the lawyer prosecuting a divorce suit for the judge to submit the witnesses provided to

any very close examination, direct or indirect ; and whether in a Court of Divorce the assurance of a lawyer as to what he *can* prove is equivalent to the actual proof itself or not, it is certain that the hearing of quite a batch of divorce suits in the half-hour between the closing of the morning session of the Court and the time for dinner does not ordinarily involve any risk of a cold repast on the part either of the Court or the witnesses.

It need hardly be matter of surprise in these circumstances if a citizen of the State of Connecticut entitled to the protection of the law in his most sacred rights should chance to return from a temporary absence on business in another State and find that in the meanwhile he had been robbed of wife and children, and of all which, for him, constituted home, on evidence which would not be sufficient before any *jury* in the State to take from a man property to the amount of five dollars, or even the possession of a pig ; and to find, moreover, that both wife and children have, by the authority of law, been placed beyond his own control, perhaps in the hands of one who has conspired and paid for his ruin. The case supposed is not wholly imaginary. There is no reason, so far as the administration of the law is concerned, why it should not be frequent ! In many cases the absence of the respondent is assured by pecuniary inducements, and in a yet larger number it must be confessed there is no opposition, because there is a common desire to be free from a burdensome restraint.

It is doubtless true that, in the main, our Courts have held themselves bound at least by the letter of the law, though their decisions are often hurried and based upon wholly unsifted evidence. And yet lax as are even the terms of the present law, it is difficult to conceive how some of the decrees of divorce which have been granted during the past five years, can be brought within the language of the so-called " omnibus clause." What shall we say of such cases as these, for instance, in which, in the western part of the State, a man and woman came into Court with the confession that they had entered into the bonds of matrimony at the mature age of three-score and ten, but that now, after three weeks experience, having become convinced of their folly, they desired relief from the Court ; or in which, after having failed to prove legal de-

sertion, the counsel simply stated his ability to prove that the husband, from whom divorce was sought, had called his wife by an opprobrious epithet, too vile and vulgar to be repeated; or in which the sole plea made was that the parties themselves had agreed through their counsel that a divorce should be had. And yet in each one of these cases, we are credibly informed, a decree of divorce was actually granted. Would not all this tend to show that the administration of no law can be wholly trusted to a Court which is private in its proceedings, unwatched in its purity, unguarded in its power, with no barriers against abuse, and in which suits are practically contested, only when property or reputation are sufficiently at stake to induce, in one case in eleven, a defense.

It is necessary to add but one feature more to our picture to present a tolerably complete view of Connecticut legislation on the subject of divorce. Our laws of divorce have proceeded ostensibly on the principle of affording legal relief to the innocent partner, in a marriage relation, from the crimes, and violence, or neglect of the other.

To afford such relief with safety to society, and without offering a dangerous premium to discontent, is the problem to be met by any wise law on the subject. It is one of the many anomalies in our present legislation, that while it provides many barriers to the continuance of the marriage relation, it opposes almost none whatever to its formation. The man or the woman, whom the law has been called upon to brand as too guilty to be tolerated in one marriage, may contract another to-morrow. A man so vile that even the wife of his bosom may not be compelled to endure his presence longer may yet take to himself, on the next day, a pure and spotless maiden, without molestation from the law. Neither neglect, nor violence, nor even crime, have been constituted by our laws a barrier to a second marriage on the part either of the guilty or the innocent.

We have laws against bigamy, and just now we have banished thousands of miles away, and out of our sight, the loathsome revival of the effete civilization of the East, on the plains of Utah, hoping that by its natural death we shall besaved the

necessity of its forcible extermination; but by the operation of our divorce laws, bigamy and polygamy have been erected into an institution which retains all their vicious attractiveness, and without some of the restraints which in Oriental communities limit the practical operation of the system. We require in our civilized polygamy only that the many wives be held in succession, and not together; and by providing a process of legal purging, through which all the obligations of one marriage are removed before the contracting of another, we relieve our polygamist of the necessity of supporting in any case more than one wife at a time. It need hardly surprise us that offering such facilities as these, our laws of divorce, which were designed to grant relief in cases of extreme hardship, have been used to a very large extent simply to remove the obstacles to the acquisition of a new and more attractive partner.

It is the testimony of the clerk of one of our Courts, who has watched very closely the operation of our divorce laws, that this is by far the largest and most prevalent motive in the hundreds of cases which have come under his observation; that in very many instances it is the pressure of this motive alone under which more serious charges, that otherwise had been pardoned and forgotten, are suddenly revived into life and vigor. Indeed, it is, as he assures us, a frequent and almost daily sight that the new and more favored lover is present in Court, to watch the fate of the money with which he has hired some lawyer to secure the removal of all legal encumbrances from the object of his lust.

In presenting this brief view of the history and present condition of legislation on the subject of divorce in Connecticut there is no time to discuss more profoundly those relations of Christianity and civil government which are involved. That in a broad and general sense our laws, our literature, and our institutions are Christian is a proposition which few will deny. It is equally clear that our legislation on this subject, above all others, ought not to be in defiance of the fundamental ideas of a Christian civilization. A union which may be dissolved at the pleasure of either of the parties, for any and every cause, or even without cause, whatever else it

may be called, is not marriage, and the continuance of the present law and of the present practice of the Courts can have but one result, and that is, so far as the authority of the State is concerned, the practical abrogation of Christian marriage, and the substitution of cohabitation by mutual contract in its place.

That the family is the basis and the unit of all stable society, and that the family in its integrity rests on the Christian idea of marriage is a truism and a commonplace; but it took six thousand years to make the family, such as it exists among us to-day in its purity and beauty, a commonplace; six thousand years of experiment before the Christian idea of marriage could be realized. Meanwhile, empires have disappeared from history because they despised the sacredness of the family institution, and nations have prospered just in proportion as they have regarded it. Sixteen years of legislation, so mistaken, have not accomplished for us all the mischief with which the principle is fraught, for civil legislation is but one of the influences which mould the institutions of Christian society. It has wrought mischief, however, which scores of years will not remove. It has impaired the sacredness and integrity of the family. It has introduced an element of doubt and uncertainty which is itself destructive of peace. It has made the threat of separation, and the application for divorce, the natural stages of a family quarrel. It has offered a premium to the formation of those thoughtless and imprudent marriages, whose fruits it proposes to remedy. It has made the State a regular resort of parties from other States to avail themselves of our exceptional legislation, till the name of Connecticut has become a name of reproach among her sister States, with a shameful notoriety surpassed by only one State in the Union. Is it not time that an end should be put to this dangerous experiment, and that the honor and welfare of the State be no longer endangered?

We shall be asked, doubtless, to continue the present freedom of divorce, for the sake of the relief which is granted by it to overwhelming wretchedness. There will be opened before us visions of human life which are indeed appalling, of lives of distrust and jealousy; of hatred and cruelty, gross and refined, not confined to the homes of the wholly debased and ignorant, but extending even into the region of high social

position—we shall be asked to contemplate pictures of domestic ruin, which it is terrible to behold—of husbands chained to wives whose indolence, passion, and neglect have made their homes veritable places of torture, where entrance is dreaded like the entrance to a prison—of wives delicate, refined, and sensitive, in the grasp of men whose breath is blasphemy—whose very love is brutal, and whose touch is pollution; and we shall be asked whether this wretchedness shall not have relief! But in asking for a remedy we ask for a cause. If this wretchedness spring from the Divine Ordinance of marriage, if the great Christian institution of the family be to blame for it, if this be the natural and inevitable fruit—then abolish the Christian ordinance of marriage, do away with the sacredness and perpetuity of the family, and substitute some convenient contract for cohabitation during the pleasure of the parties in its stead. If a high idea of the family and pure legislation to guard its sacredness have produced these evils, then open wide the doors of all possible license which is asked. But the price of the highest good is always the risk of the greatest evil. The seclusion, the mutual dependence, the intimate sympathy, the indivisible life—those very elements which are the source of the greatest blessedness of married life—must, when perverted, be the source of its keenest torture. It is not however by destroying the sacredness of the relationship, and degrading it to the level of a temporary contract, but by vindicating its honor, and guarding its purity, that we are to remedy the evils we are called upon to contemplate. It is in spite of all which Christianity and Christian legislation have done, that there still exist such low ideas of the marriage relation, and of the sacredness of its obligations, and that the institution designed to be the centre of all that is most pure and most blessed on earth, the first installment of Paradise, is so often degraded and profaned. We are sometimes told, indeed, that this misery is simply the result of *ill-assorted* marriages; but the fact is that there is no known method of “sorting” such characters as those most familiar to our Courts of Divorce, by which happiness can be reasonably expected in the result. They are ill-assorted, but simply because they are, to a very large extent, unfit for any relation of social life. To separate and recombine such elements as these

can, from the very nature of the case, only be a permutation of misery.

So long as human society remains imperfect—so long as there are ignorant, or degraded, or vicious men and women, so long there will remain unhappiness, even under the wisest laws, and the wisest constitution of the State; but we believe that the full realization of the idea of the Christian family will one day remove all unhappiness, and that in the meantime we shall approach nearest the final goal by surrounding marriage with all the sanctions and safeguards in our power. In what in a Christian State shall these sanctions and safeguards consist? Certainly not in going beyond the words of Christ himself, as the Catholic Church has sometimes done in its sacrament of matrimony, and making it absolutely indissoluble. But on what principle then shall its dissolution ever be permitted? Here the turning point among Christians, between those who would restrict divorce exclusively to the cause of adultery, and those who would admit some other causes beside, is to be found in the interpretation to be given to 1 Cor. vii. 15. This passage has been held, even in the Catholic Church, to justify divorce for desertion in the case of a heretic, and since the Reformation by far the larger portion of Protestant commentators have construed it as extending to all continued and malicious desertion. The Puritans of New Haven, as we have already shown, founded their legislation upon this interpretation.

It would probably be impossible, to-day, where a stricter interpretation of this passage can claim only the consideration of a private conviction, to set aside a principle which has obtained for more than two hundred years in the legislation of the State. But in making this concession we have reached the utmost limit of liberty which can claim for itself any authority of precedent in the writings of the New Testament. In cases of great personal distress there will ever be a pressure, which even the Christian legislator will feel, to grant such relief as the public good may admit. If divorce be granted for malicious desertion it will be difficult to restrain the conviction that similar relief may yet more be afforded for such "evil and fierce usage," to quote again the language of the proposed enactment of Edward the Sixth, as endangers life and health. It

is difficult to establish any rules for such exceptional things as revolutions; but whatever principle is laid down, it must not be incompatible with the very existence of government, and so no cause of divorce can be admitted which endangers the very existence of the family. A decree of divorce implies a forfeiture of all conjugal rights on the part of the person against whom it is obtained. Can such forfeiture be wrought, save—as in its civil counterpart disfranchisement—by crime, of which it is felt to be the fitting attendant penalty. Divorce in the case of offenses where the very institution of the family would be outraged by its refusal; where it should be seen and felt to be not a release from virtuous restraint, but an exemplary punishment of conjugal crime; and where it should bring not fresh impunity in wrong to the guilty, but shame and reproach for the wrong which has been done—such divorce as this can bring no peril to the State or to Christian society. The statute book of Connecticut, to-day, is disgraced by a law under which it is not too much to say that divorce, in well nigh a majority of cases, is the very opposite of this. Instead of the penalty of the guilty, it is the reward of the vicious. Instead of being the relief of misfortune, it is a premium to unhappiness. Instead of furnishing a sanction to the purity of the family, it has dishonored the marriage tie with a rapidly accumulating force of demoralization which has at last called forth indignant remonstrance from a thousand voices, and from every part of the State. Let these voices be multiplied. Let every man who has smarted under a sense of the shame which rests upon our beloved State add his own protest against its further continuance. Let every representative and senator who is sent to the General Assembly be made to feel that he will not be welcomed home by a Christian constituency if he has failed to cast his vote against this iniquity. Let the “general misconduct” clause be swept at once from the enactment. Let the decree of divorce be granted only on account of distinct and definite crime, capable of proof, and supported by definite legal evidence, which, when once proved, shall render the guilty party incapable of marrying again. Let the relief of the innocent be further guarded from the abuse of the guilty. Let the State be represented by counsel, in every application where there is no appearance for the defense,

that the public good may be guarded against collusion and fraud. Let the guilty, though deprived of the privileges, be held forever responsible, in the obligations of marriage, and therefore for the support of the innocent wife or children whom he has wronged, and much will have been done to wipe away the reproach, and to restore the honor and safety of the State.

ARTICLE III.—THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN
NEW ENGLAND.

The Protestant Episcopal Church in New Haven and for New England. A Sermon preached at the Semi-centennial Celebration of the Consecration of Trinity Church, New Haven, Wednesday, Feb. 16th, 1866, by EDWIN HARWOOD, D. D., Rector. Published by the Vestry. New Haven. 1866.

It is with no controversial view that we offer to our readers some remarks on the sermon preached by Dr. Harwood at the semi-centennial commemoration of the consecration of the edifice in which he ministers. The occasion was one in which both the parish and the rector might reasonably rejoice; and some men, preaching on such an occasion, would have found it necessary, in the congratulations of the day, to insult, or at least to offend with unkind disparagement, all non-Episcopalian Christians. But we are happy to testify that we find no fault with Dr. Harwood in that respect. He is chary (it may be said) in his recognition of any *clergy* or *churches* in New England other than those of his own ecclesiastical connection; but we take no offense at his reluctance, for we can conceive that in the necessity of avoiding offense in other quarters he had a good reason for carefulness; and we cheerfully acknowledge that when he speaks of "the pastors and teachers of New England," there is no lack of courtesy in his tone and manner. It is worth mentioning that he is not ashamed to speak of "the *Protestant Episcopal* Church in New Haven and for New England." A preacher holding with "the straitest sect" of Anglicanism would have avoided that denominational title as implying the existence or the possibility of churches not Episcopal, and if he had happened to choose the same subject would have given to the public a pamphlet on "*the Church* in New Haven and for New England." Dr. Harwood is above the level of such follies. He finds that the ecclesiastical body to which he belongs is not so narrow and arrogant as to proclaim itself the whole and only Church of God in the United States; and he is not ashamed to

speak of it by the title by which, in its constitution and canons and in its prayer-book, it distinguishes itself from other churches.

Half a century of years is no inconsiderable period in ecclesiastical history. Only thirty-six half-centuries intervene between Dr. Harwood preaching his semi-centennial sermon in Trinity Church, New Haven, and Paul the Apostle dictating to an amanuensis, in prison at Rome, the last of his epistles. Perhaps the writer of this article may be pardoned for intruding his individuality upon the reader so far as to say that almost the entire period covered by the sermon falls within his personal recollections of New Haven. He first saw Trinity Church less than two years after its consecration, when it was—as for some years it continued to be—the only Gothic or sham-Gothic thing in New England, save the pointed windows of the Federal street meeting-house in Boston. More than forty years ago, on the Monday morning after his investiture with the pastoral office, he was honored with a friendly call from Dr. Harwood's predecessor, who by a special invitation from the committee of arrangements, had been present at the installation on the Wednesday preceding.* From that time to the death of Dr. Croswell, thirty-three years afterward, the intercourse between him and the writer, though never pretending to be intimate, was constant and without any interruption of mutual courtesy and neighborly good feeling. Almost everything mentioned by Dr. Harwood in sketching that half century of parochial history comes freshly to our memory as we read.

Going back only fifty years, we are at that period of antiquity when the people in these parts of New England had not learned that it was their right and their duty to make arrangements for warming their houses of worship in winter. To persons born less than fifty years ago, the statement is hardly credible; yet it is literally true. We had not thought how strange the fact is, nor how significant, till we found Dr. Har-

* Perhaps strict justice to the "churchmanship" of the late Dr. Croswell requires us to refer more distinctly to the fact that the installation was *not* an ordination, and therefore the most devout believer in the exclusive validity of Episcopal "orders" might be present without compromising his conscience.

wood mentioning it, not without wonder, as an instance of the progress which we have made since then in wealth and in our care for personal comfort. Trinity Church, New Haven, was first furnished with stoves in 1822, the example having been given, we believe, two or three years earlier, by the First Ecclesiastical Society, in the Center Church. It is just fifty years, if our memory serves us, since arrangements to mitigate the arctic cold of the New England winter were introduced into the First Church at Hartford. The chapel of Yale College was never warmed for morning or evening prayers, nor for Sabbath services, till some years after the death of President Dwight in 1817. Congregationalists and Episcopalians, Baptists and Methodists, we believe, were all alike in this respect; and all alike, within a few years after the old custom had begun to be broken, found out that there was no sin and no peril in warming a house of worship. The marvel now is how our fathers could have fallen into the practice of worshipping God with the thermometer at zero, when almost nothing in the country was so abundant as fuel, and how anybody could object—as we know many did—to the proposal of a reformation so simple and so necessary to the edification of all worshipping assemblies. Yet the explanation is not very difficult in the light of some well-known principles of human nature. The settlers of New England came from a climate in which winter has no rigors such as those which characterize our winter. Even now, we believe, no artificial warmth is necessary at any season in the churches and chapels of England; and stoves in railway carriages are never thought of there. It is not strange, then, that when the emigrants from England built their first places of worship here—which was before they had thoroughly tried the climate—they did not think it necessary to deviate from the English custom of building without chimneys. They had come thither with the intention of constituting churches that should be purer, more spiritual, and more conformed to the apostolic model, than the congregations of the English national Church; but they had no thought of constructing church edifices that should be more luxurious or more comfortable than those they left behind them. They intended to found new states, and therefore they re-

nounced the laws and the legislative power of England, but they had not crossed the ocean with any thought of making improvements in church architecture. Very naturally, therefore, when they built their humble meeting houses, they did so without thinking that in a climate so unlike that of their mother country, a house of worship ought to have some sort of a fire-place. The first meeting-houses having been built without deviating in that respect from the English tradition, and the rigor of a few winters having been endured in them, the conservative tendency began to operate. Inasmuch as there was no precedent for a heating apparatus in the house of the Lord, anything of that kind would be an innovation; and if such an innovation should be introduced for the sake of ease and bodily comfort, who could tell what would come of it? It must be admitted that the conservative spirit in matters of religion is sometimes a little blind; nor can we deny that sometimes it is obstinate in proportion as the position to be guarded is unreasonable. Self-sacrifice, and a determined rising above the power of outward sensations, entered largely into the Puritan idea of worship; and when prayers and sermons in an arctic atmosphere had been associated with the memory of saintly fathers who had been edified notwithstanding the cold, and whose worship every winter had been a sort of martyrdom by frost instead of fire, there was something like presumption in the thought of attempting to worship in a more comfortable way than that which they had found sufficient for their edification. Thus it came to pass that almost two hundred years from the landing at Plymouth were counted, before houses of worship in New England began to be warmed for the relief of the congregations. On the first Lord's day of this nineteenth century the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was administered in one kind only to the communicants in the First Church at Hartford, for the reason that when the pastor (Dr. Strong) "took the cup" according to the ritual, "the fruit of the vine," being frozen, could not be poured out in memory of Christ's blood. Yet though Dr. Strong was accustomed to give sermons of not more than fifteen minutes in severe weather, because, as his saying was, there was "little use in preaching to people when their toes were cold," fifteen years of the new century were numbered before the people of that congregation

had wrested from their own conservative prejudices the privilege of having stoves in the house of worship.*

Dr. Harwood takes notice of the facts, which he derives from the parish records, that simultaneously with the building of the new church, there was a large accession to the parish; and that after the consecration, "on the third day of the feast," Bishop Hobart of New York, then officiating in the vacant diocese of Connecticut, confirmed a large number of candidates, among whom were some very aged persons whom he names. Our earlier acquaintance with New Haven enables us to supplement his story with illustrations which, though local in themselves, have more than local significance.

The central square in the town-plot of New Haven was reserved by the original proprietors of the township for public uses, and is constantly spoken of in the old records as "the market-place." For what purposes they reserved it, is evident from the manner in which they used it. They first placed at its center a humble church edifice, of which the present Center Church is the lineal successor; and around that rustic temple—west, north, and south—they made their graves. They used it also as a *campus martius*, or place of military exercises. At a later time other public buildings were placed on the same public ground in accordance with the design of those who reserved it for such uses, and who never intended that it should become a "park" or mere pleasure ground; there was the public school-house, there the jail, and there the "State-house," so called long before Connecticut became an independent State.

* The incident of the wine frozen on the communion table is not on record within our knowledge; and there may be no person living who remembers it. But it is given on the authority of the writer's mother, who was present at that communion, and who happened to mention the singular fact not long before her death, sixteen years ago. Probably the prejudice against stoves in places of worship broke down first in the northernmost parts of New England. We remember reading in a newspaper, more than fifty years ago, the story of what had then recently happened on a very cold Sunday, somewhere in Vermont, where the people, yielding to the stress of weather, and not understanding the chemical process of combustion and the relation of its products to respiration, carried a potash-kettle into their meeting-house and made a fire of charcoal in it. Fortunately (if our memory serves us right) a timely opening of the doors saved the parish from the depopulation which otherwise would have been the result.

The jail was removed not far from the year 1800; the school-house remained a few years longer. In 1812, the buildings on the public square were the State-house, a little north of where Trinity Church now stands; the "Middle Brick meeting-house," on the site now occupied by the Center Church; and a wooden edifice for public worship, on the site of the present North Church, being one of the two meeting-houses alternately occupied by the congregation of "the United Societies of White Haven and Fair Haven"—now "the United Society." In the growth of the city, the "Middle Brick" had become too small for the congregation of the First Ecclesiastical Society, which then enjoyed the privilege of being the local parish in which every new comer into the city was included by law, unless he voluntarily enrolled himself with some other congregation, and which, for about eight years, had been flourishing under the ministry first of Moses Stuart and then of Nathaniel W. Taylor. The Society was not only numerous but wealthy; its current expenses were burdensome to none. At the close of the year 1812, seven of its wealthiest members proposed, on certain conditions, to demolish the old meeting-house (though it had stood less than sixty years, and was in perfect preservation) and to build a larger and statelier temple according to plans which they exhibited. One of the conditions was that they were to take the chance of being reimbursed by the sale of the pews in the new house, one-third of the sittings being reserved as the absolute property of the Society. The generous proposal was accepted, and the building of the Center Church soon led to the building of the North Church, and then of Trinity Church. All three of the Christian temples which now adorn the central square of New Haven, giving to it so much of its beauty and impressiveness, were built so nearly at once that the second and third were commenced before the first was completed.

But this is not half the story. The scheme for building the Center Church was not acceptable to all the society. In the society meeting it encountered earnest opposition, and was warmly debated. There were pew-holders whose property in the pews which they had purchased or inherited would be destroyed in the demolition of the old house. There were some who had a vivid presentiment of the prices at which pews in

the new house would be sold, if the cost of the building should be reimbursed in that way. And then the conservative spirit which clings to whatever is old came to the aid of all other objections, and gave them a sort of moral dignity. Among the opponents was Dr. Encas Monson, a venerable man, almost four score years old, who was then, and for more than ten years afterwards, the patriarch of the medical profession in Connecticut, and whose infinite humor and various eccentricity, not less than his professional eminence, are still celebrated in tradition. He made a characteristic speech against the proposal, arguing that the old house had been built within his memory, and was still good enough for him, begging that it might stand for the little while that he had to live, and intimating that after his death he should make no more opposition. Another humorist, Jonathan E. Porter, Esq., replied that what the Doctor had said was true; he was indeed an old man, and would not be able to object much longer; but it must be considered that old men always leave old men to take their places, and that when this "old Dr. Monson" should be gone, there would surely be some other "old Dr. Monson" to make the same objections. The proposal, as we have said, was accepted, notwithstanding the opposition, and the contract proposed was made. But the opponents of the measure were determined to renew the conflict, and the meeting was hardly dissolved before they began to subscribe and circulate a requisition for another meeting, at which the whole matter should be in some way reconsidered. Their movement was baffled by the unexpected celerity of the contractors for the building. Such was the promptness with which those gentlemen, and especially the late Hon. Isaac Mills, proceeded to their work, that hardly thirty-six hours, including the Sabbath, were allowed to pass before the actual demolition of the "old Middle Brick" was begun.

Of course the opposition was not conciliated, nor even subdued, by being thus defeated. In modern times, the conflict might have resulted in a withdrawal of the malcontents, either to connect themselves with the other Congregational Society in the city or to form a new society of the same denomination. But those were the days when Congregationalism in Connecticut was subject to the restrictions and inconveniences, without

having in any considerable degree the supposed advantages, of an ecclesiastical system established by law. The First Society, originally identical with the town, was a territorial corporation. The other Congregational Society was what was formerly called in Massachusetts a "poll parish," having the same parochial bounds with its elder sister, but including only the descendants of those families which were originally "set off" from the First Society with parish privileges, together with those persons (and their descendants) who, on removing into New Haven, had chosen to enroll themselves in the "new-light" society. No way had been provided in which anybody could pass over directly from one of those two conterminous parishes to the other. But a Congregationalist could lawfully become an Episcopalian, and pass over from either parish of the Standing Order into the parish of Trinity Church; and an Episcopalian could become a Congregationalist, and choose for himself between the two Congregational parishes. For example, a parishioner, discontented under the severe "new divinity" preaching of Dr. Edwards, (when that renowned theologian was minister of the White Haven Society), and preferring to sit under the elegant "old divinity" sermons of Dr. Dana, could indulge that preference only by certificating himself into the Episcopal society, and thence, after hearing Dr. Hubbard for a few months, into the First Society. Such was the position of the indignant minority when their "holy and beautiful house" was pulled down, as it were, over their heads, by the will of the majority. There was no way in which they could adequately maintain and carry out their opposition to the determined will of the majority but by disconnecting themselves from the Standing Order—that is, by ceasing to be in law Congregationalists. Accordingly, one or two went over to the small Methodist society which had been in existence a few years, one certificated himself into the nearest Baptist society, and the others went to the Episcopal society. In those days, the ordinary division of the people of Connecticut, ecclesiastically, was into three classes: the Standing Order, the Episcopalians, and "the minor sects." The Episcopalians were more kindly and more respectfully regarded than any other body of dissenters from the established ecclesiastical system. Their political sympathies,

more than those of the minor sects, were with the Federal party. Their filial relation to the Church of England inspired their clergy and most of their more intelligent laymen with something of that antipathy to French principles which characterized so largely the Federal party, especially in New England. Of course the persons who were determined on withdrawing from the First Society—being under a necessity of attaching themselves to an ecclesiastical society of some other denomination in order to that withdrawal, and most of them, if not all, being Federalists—went, almost in a body, to the Episcopal Society. Probably Trinity Church parish had never received so great an addition in so short a time, as it received in consequence of the trouble which arose out of the scheme for building a new meeting-house in the First Society.

Another effect of that building enterprise redounded to the further advancement of the Protestant Episcopal Church in New Haven. A separation from the original Church of New Haven was commenced in 1742, and after fifteen years of conflict was legalized by the colonial government. The oppressed malcontents, or New Lights, had become a voting majority in the ecclesiastical society from which they had desired to escape but had not been permitted, and they were beginning to teach their oppressors the lesson, "with what measure ye mete it shall be measured to you again." In that condition of affairs, the Legislature interposed, incorporated the adherents of the new light church by the name of the White Haven Society, giving them their share of the parish property. The new society was, from the date of its incorporation, much larger, numerically, than the old; and after a few years it was strong enough to have a new quarrel within itself, and to be cut in twain by the incorporation of the Fair Haven Society. But in 1796, the difficulties having been removed, White Haven and Fair Haven became the United Society, with two houses of worship—the "Old Blue" or White Haven meeting-house, on the southeast corner of Church and Elm streets, and the "North Revenge" (as it was sometimes called) or Fair Haven meeting-house, on the public square. In 1813, when the First Society, in the face of opposition from within and from without, was going forward with its building enterprise, and the present Cen-

ter Church was rising on the old site, the United Society was induced to enter upon a similar undertaking, and with a similar result. A dissatisfied minority went over to the Episcopal society, because they had no other convenient way of escaping from what they deemed a burthen unreasonably imposed by the majority, and from the extravagance of building so costly and splendid a meeting-house, when the society had already two meeting-houses good enough for them. It was once a proverb in Connecticut—perhaps originating from this chapter of New Haven history—that the parish quarrels of the Standing Order were among the “converting ordinances” of the Episcopal Church.

Of course, the new members of the Episcopal society had hardly learned to find the places in the Prayer-book, when it was discovered that the society to which they had fled for refuge from the building mania had become numerous enough to require as large a place of worship as any other, and strong enough to build it. Episcopalianism, thus reinforced, had become more of a power in New Haven than it had ever been before. The Episcopal society was permitted, without any opposition, to place its church edifice on the public square; and the three Christian temples which now stand embowered among venerable elms, and which are so distinctly pictured in the memory of all who ever saw New Haven, became thenceforth the characteristic feature of the city, which but for them would never have been celebrated as the most beautiful city on the continent.

We must not omit to say that the financial scheme for building the new Episcopal church was more wisely contrived than that which had been adopted by the other two societies for their building enterprises. The Center Church and the North were to be paid for by the *sale* of pews, but Trinity Church was to be built with funds raised on the credit of the corporation, and the income from the annual *leasing* of the pews was expected to pay the interest and ultimately the principal of the debt. The two former were to be forever encumbered with the rights of pew-owners; in the latter there was to be no individual ownership. In the former, every man who wanted a place for his family was to be under the necessity of purchasing a pew by a considerable outlay, or else he must be a tenant under some

individual proprietor, and pay rent in addition to all his parish taxes or contributions; in the latter, no man was expected to pay more than his yearly rent for such a pew as might best suit his ability and his inclination, and his pew-rent was to be simply his yearly contribution to the parish treasury. In the building of the former, it was assumed that the policy of the State in regard to ecclesiastical societies and the support of public worship would remain unchanged; but in the scheme for building the other, there was a foresight of new laws and a new constitution for the State.

The consecration of Trinity Church, New Haven, on the 16th of February, 1816, synchronizes remarkably with a memorable crisis in the political history of Connecticut. About that time, Calvin Goddard, of Norwich, had been proposed in the newspapers of the Federalist party as a candidate for the office of Lieutenant Governor, which was then a high and honorable place in the state government. Lieutenant Governor Goodrich, who would of course have been re-elected, according to the "steady habits" of those days, had died a few months before, and Mr. Goddard had been agreed upon as the man for the place in a consultation among the members of the Legislature at the October session. But just about the 16th of February, 1816, Jonathan Ingersoll, of New Haven, senior warden of Trinity Church, was nominated in opposition to Mr. Goddard; and at the "Freemen's Meetings" in the several towns, on the second Tuesday in April, by the aid of votes from the party which called itself "republican," but was stigmatized by its opponents as "democratic," he was elected—the first dissenter from the Standing Order who was ever elected to that office in Connecticut. A demonstration had been made of what could be done by the union of Episcopalians with the political party which had been identified with the principles of the French revolution; and the result was, that in the next annual election the new "Toleration party" was victorious. Oliver Wolcott, who had been Secretary of the Treasury in the Federalist administration of John Adams, and whom the partisans of Jefferson had charged with the crime of setting fire to the Treasury Department for the sake of destroying the proof of his frauds and defalcations, but who had not ceased to be respected in

Connecticut for his ability and integrity, as well as for his old Federalism and his honored name, was elected Governor in the place of John Cotton Smith. The next year, 1818, Governor Wolcott appointed the rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, to preach at the election solemnity in Hartford—the first election sermon that ever was preached in Connecticut by a dissenter from the established ecclesiastical system.

Among the names mentioned by Dr. Harwood as worthy to be commemorated in his parish history, there is one which we cannot refrain from mentioning in this connection. The Hon. Nathan Smith—long an eminent lawyer and advocate, and at the time of his death, in 1835, a Senator from Connecticut in Congress—was a man who could not fail to see from the first that the contention in the two Congregational societies in New Haven might redound greatly to the increase of the Episcopal society; and he was the man who could best manage matters to that end.* No man in Connecticut was more capable than he of discerning, when the war of 1812 was ended—when Britain and her allies had finally triumphed over the French revolution—when France had twice submitted to the humiliation of seeing Paris occupied by the victorious enemies of her empire—when Napoleon was shut up in St. Helena—when Congress had again established a national bank—when the navy had become the pride of the nation, while Jefferson's gunboats had gone to the moles and the bats—that a new era had begun in our national politics, and that old issues between Federalists and Republicans were dead. He was the man more capable than any other of seizing the fortunate opportunity for a new combination and arrangement of parties in Connecticut. He was not ambitious of political preferment for himself—other men might have the offices—other men might figure as leaders of the Toleration party—he was willing to stand behind them; but we have no doubt that the political change in Connecticut, which began in 1816 and was completed by the adoption of a

* His influence controlled the building of the present Trinity Church so effectually that he overruled the architect. Mr. Town's plan included an apsis for chancel and vestry, but Mr. Smith—perhaps by way of making some concession to the Puritan taste then prevalent—determined that there should be nothing so much like a "Dutch oven" built on in the rear of the church.

new constitution for the State in 1818, was wrought by his sagacity and his skill in public affairs more than by any other personal influence.

From the date, then, of the building of the new Trinity Church in New Haven, the history of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut may be regarded as beginning a new chapter. Thirty-three years had passed since the British recognition of American independence cut off from the clergy and congregations of that order their last hope of a continued political connection with the mother country. Generally the old men who were tories in the time of the revolutionary conflict, and who could not but accept American nationality with its new government as an established fact, had been attracted by their conservative and anti-Gallican sympathies to that which they recognized as the conservative party—the party of established order against Jacobinical notions of government—the party which professed to uphold Christianity against French infidelity—the party of Washington and Hamilton against the party of Jefferson and Aaron Burr—the party of John Jay against the party of Thomas Paine. Yet the fact that they were Federalists, in relation to national and international questions, had by no means taken away their traditional antipathy to Puritanism and to the privileges or supposed privileges of the standing order in Connecticut; and when a favorable opportunity came, they were ready to act under the influence of that antipathy. Fifty years ago, the Protestant Episcopal Church in Connecticut had outlived the revolutionary conflict long enough to overcome, on the one hand, the unfortunate association of ideas by which, in popular feeling, it had been identified with British toryism; and, on the other hand, to begin to have a clergy and a laity who were as ready to be democrats, and to use the aid of party politicians, in a republic, as their predecessors had been to be tories under a royal government, and to coöperate with the place-men who held that America existed for Britain and should be governed by the British Parliament. From that date it was no longer an exotic, but was fairly naturalized in New England, and prepared to perform its part as being, in numbers, in wealth, and in the learning

and culture of its clergy, only second among the ecclesiastical organizations of Connecticut.

It was very natural, therefore, for Dr. Harwood, in his historical discourse, to connect with the summary record of fifty years of parochial history some general considerations concerning the position and proper work of the Protestant Episcopal Church in relation to New England. We have lingered so long in our gossiping reminiscences, that we have little time for the more important topics to which we are led by our author in his survey of the present and the future.

One thought we must express, at the outset, concerning the sympathies and antipathies between Episcopalians and Congregationalists. Dr. Harwood says to his people: "Remember that here, in New England, your forefathers were called upon to face a spirit of distrust, suspicion, and animosity, which is not entirely extinct, though it no longer persists in showing its rough edge." We trust he will not be displeased if we tell him that we can remember—and probably the elder portion at least of his congregation can also remember—something more than this. The "spirit of distrust, suspicion, and animosity," in the times he speaks of, was not all on one side, nor was the "rough edge" of it exhibited on one side only. Such is human nature, and such is the imperfection even of respectably good men, that antipathies between bodies of professedly Christian people, living in schismatic or semi-schismatic relations to each other, are ordinarily reciprocal. Dr. Harwood, we are sure, would not think of saying that the Episcopal clergy and laity of Connecticut, fifty or a hundred years ago, were among the Congregational clergy and laity simply as so many lambs among wolves; nor that the Congregationalists of those times were among their Episcopalian neighbors simply as so many wolves among lambs. He would hardly think of saying that when the men of Hebron, at the beginning of the Revolutionary War, expelled from their coasts, with threats of tar and feathers, the notorious Parson Peters (as notorious then as Parson Brownlow now is), they had received no provocation, and were merely venting their "distrust, suspicion, and animosity" against embodied meekness, innocence, and love. For our part we are of opinion that through all the succession of the "forefathers" of

the present Trinity Church congregation in New Haven, from the days of Colonel Heathcote downward, their animosity toward their neighbors has never been less than the animosity of their neighbors toward them. Asperities of that sort have softened in later years, and we thankfully trust that on both sides they are passing away. We happen to remember an opprobrious name, not often found in print, by which Episcopalians in Connecticut, fifty years ago, were accustomed to designate Congregationalists; but presuming that now they have quite forgotten it, we will not renew the remembrance of it, and will only say that the Congregationalists had no corresponding name of reproach for Episcopalians. At present, we are quite sure, their feeling in New England and elsewhere, toward the Protestant Episcopal Church, is kind and charitable, and we trust that the feeling is increasingly reciprocated. Now and then some "Rev. Cream Cheese," or other half-witted neophyte in orders, exposes himself in such a fashion that it is impossible not to laugh at him; but the laughter in those cases is not unmixed with sympathy for the good people who are most annoyed by the folly. The feeling of our ministers and churches was never farther than it is to-day from submitting to a clerical or prelatival church-government, or from hampering public worship with a book of forms from which there can be no deviation; they never regarded high-church pretensions with less respect than now; they abhor the superstition akin to *fetichism* which enters so largely into the religion of Oxford tractarians; and they have as little relish for the unbelief of Bishop Colenso and the Oxford essayists; but they insist on recognizing the Protestant Episcopal Church as one of the "evangelical denominations," notwithstanding its lack of free prayer and of self-government in the local church, and notwithstanding the superstition on the one hand and the rationalism on the other with which the Church of England is infested.

The statement which Dr. Harwood makes concerning the difference between the Episcopal Church and "the pastors and teachers of New England,"—though we shall attempt to show that it is not perfectly accurate—may be accepted as a proof that in the general progress of religious thought and knowledge these two bodies of clergy, and with them the two bodies of

professed Christians which they respectively serve, are nearer than they once were to a full mutual understanding and a mutual Christian toleration. He says frankly, what Bishop Hobart and the men of that school would have been afraid to say, that the difference is "not, be it understood, respecting the work of our redemption through our blessed Lord, nor our hope of salvation." Surely this is not the old talk about some indefinite and "uncovenanted mercies of God," in which was the only "hope of salvation" for persons not within the pale of the Episcopal Church. We trust that our author may be regarded as expressing on this point not his own personal feeling merely but the feeling and judgment of his brethren also. Let his testimony be remembered, for it is true. The Congregational Churches of New England have always recognized "the doctrinal part of those commonly called the Articles of the Church of England," coördinately with the Westminster standards and the Savoy confession, not indeed as having any authority over them, nor as given by any extraordinary inspiration, but as setting forth a system of doctrines in substantial agreement with "the perfect and only rule of faith and practice," which is the word of God in the Scriptures.

In regard to Dr. Harwood's affirmative statement of the difference between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the New England Churches, we have somewhat to say, not controversially, but rather by way of inquiry and suggestion; for, as we have already intimated, his statement, though made in a candid and liberal spirit, is not, in our view, perfectly accurate. The difference in question, as he regards it, is a difference mainly on two points, "the relation of Christian theology to Christian faith, and the terms of communion." That we may not misrepresent him, we give his statement not in our own words but in his.

First, concerning the relation of Christian theology to Christian faith, he says:

"In New England, Christianity, *to all intents and purposes*, has been identified with a system, or systems of theology. Christianity, accordingly, in the public mind, has meant a scheme of doctrine. I do not mean to assert nor to imply that the pastors of the Congregational churches have overlooked the moralities of the New Testament; but simply that the one overshadowing characteristic of the

New England method and spirit must be found in the doctrinal instruction received by the people, and in their doctrinal belief. This instruction led to confessions of faith, more or less elaborate, which were proffered to candidates for admission into membership with particular congregations, as tests, or conditions, or absolute preliminaries to full communion and fellowship. These confessions of faith contained, of course, theological propositions, which, when they were prepared, were the full expression of the belief of the congregations. But it has happened with them, as with all other kindred documents, that a generation came and then another, no longer in sympathy with them. What is the natural movement of the mind, in this sphere of its action? First, there is indifference; next, there is silent dislike; and lastly, there is open war. The Unitarian outbreak in Massachusetts was the grand climax of the protest against the prevailing teaching. The people, in certain other portions of New England, in certain portions of Massachusetts itself, as well as in Connecticut, fell, in large numbers, under the influence of the Methodists, with their broad assertion of the freedom of the human will, while others sought the communion of our Church."

"We plant ourselves, and stand firmly upon the simple creed of the Church, as the condition of communion, and as the true embodiment of what constitutes the unalterable Christian faith. Do you ask what I mean by the simple creed of the church? I mean the Apostles' creed, which should be considered as the expansion of the original baptismal formula. By it we assert our faith in the Fatherhood of Almighty God, in the Sonship and redemptive work of Jesus Christ, in the Holy Ghost, the Sanctifier, and in His work in the Church; and in the life everlasting. The creed of the Council of Nice, which was framed to meet a heresy touching the person of our Lord, we also accept, and recognize as a larger statement of the contents of the Apostles' creed. We demand, then, I repeat, the reception of the unalterable faith, in this respect following ancient practice; and we leave the question of scientific theology or of systems of doctrines, to the individual judgment. We do not interfere with the Christian liberty either of clergy or of people. We do not identify Christianity with a current system of metaphysics, nor of metaphysical divinity. We distinguish between faith and opinion. We insist upon the faith, in its historical sense and meaning, while opinion is beyond or outside of law, and does not come under the supervision of an ecclesiastical inquisition, whether in the form of a board of deacons, or of a council, or of a standing committee, or of a convention.

"The mind of New England is intelligent and acute, and therefore we present this distinction. We seek to make known the cardinal position of the church. We are governed by a principle. We are the exponents of a great law, to be asserted here and everywhere, that the faith of the church is one, and is unalterable, while systems of theology are, from their very nature, subject to the changes which mark all the efforts of the reflecting mind; and we simply call men to the reception of the one faith, the creed of the church of all past time. We are in sympathy with the Christian past, and we have large hope in the future, and our church ought to grow in New England, because it thus in the sphere of faith and thought presents distinctly the two poles of stability and progress. There is stability in its creed; there is progress in its thought, under the conditions and limitations which a general reception of the creed imposes."

In a foot-note appended to the last of the paragraphs above quoted, the author makes further explanation of his meaning:

“ ‘Theology’—‘Creed’—what is the difference? *The Creed* is the simple statement (without any *raisonnement*) of the articles, which in the judgment of the Church constitute the substance of the Christian faith.

“Theology, or dogmatic or systematic divinity, means the scientific or systematic representation of the truths or facts embraced in the creed, together with other points of Christian belief and Christian feeling, derived in part from Scripture, in part from Christian usage, and in part from personal experience.

“Of course, this systematic scientific arrangement is the work of individual minds, and partakes therefore of the fortunes of all intellectual endeavor. Its worth changes with changing times and modes of thought. This is exemplified in the history of Christian doctrine, and in our theological literature. The science of one age must yield to the achievement of another, but the *substance of the belief* of the Church remains one, and unchanging.”

The distinction which this statement gives between theology and religion, or between dogma and Christian faith, is clearly drawn and is essentially just. But the statement that the recognition of this distinction on the one hand, and ignorance or forgetfulness of it on the other, is a main difference between the Protestant Episcopal Church and “the pastors and teachers of New England” is questionable. Is it quite accurate in point of fact to say just what our author says in the name of the Episcopal Church? “We leave the question of scientific theology, or of systems of doctrines, to the *individual judgment*. We do not interfere with the Christian liberty either of *clergy* or of people. We do not identify Christianity with a current system of *metaphysics*, nor of *metaphysical divinity*. We distinguish between faith and opinion. We insist on faith, in its *historical* sense and meaning, while *opinion* is *beyond or outside of law*, and does not come under the supervision of an ecclesiastical inquisition, whether in the form of a board of deacons, or of a council, or of a *standing committee*, or of a *convention*.” The diocesan “standing committee,” and the “convention,” it will be observed, are institutions of the Episcopal Church, and the affirmation is that the clergy of that denomination are not responsible to standing committee or convention, or to any other “ecclesiastical inquisition,” for the soundness of their opinions on points of “metaphysical divinity” or of “scientific theology.” Is it exactly so? Does the Pro-

testant Episcopal Church in the United States refer all "systems of doctrines"—all matters of religious opinion in distinction from the few and simple points of the Apostles' creed—to the tribunal of "individual judgment?"

Open the Prayer-book, and let us see what it will show us. Between the Psalter and the "Form and manner of making, ordaining and consecrating bishops, priests and deacons," stands that memorable document which has been so much in the way of romanizing priests and deacons, and which may be equally effectual to trip up those of rationalizing tendency. What degree of authority the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England (or the Thirty-eight Articles as they stand in the American recension) have in the Protestant Episcopal Church, as here organized and governed, we need not precisely determine. That they are in some sort a standard of orthodoxy—that the clergy, though not required to subscribe them, are expected to teach in accordance with them, and are liable to trial and censure for renouncing or contradicting them—that they set forth propositions which the Episcopal Church in the United States authoritatively affirms and pledges itself to maintain—will not be denied or doubted. Every clergyman, before ordination, must bind himself "to conform to the doctrines and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church," and where are the doctrines and worship of that Church but in its Prayer-book? Looking now at the title of these famous Articles, we find that they are "Articles of *Religion*;" but looking at the matter of them, we find that they are in fact only dogmas or opinions—"theological propositions," harder and more angular by far than even the Westminster and Savoy confessions. We submit that the statement of our excellent and learned friend on what he regards as the first main difference between Episcopalianism and Congregationalism in New England cannot be accepted as entirely accurate in relation to the Episcopal Church. We submit that while the Articles stand in the Prayer-book as an authoritative setting forth of doctrine to which every clergyman must conform, that church does *not* "leave the question of scientific theology or of systems of doctrines to the individual judgment;" that it does "interfere with the Christian

liberty" of its clergy; and that it does, to that extent, "identify Christianity with" what was once, if it is not now, "a current system of metaphysical divinity."

The reformation from Popery in England, not less than in Scotland and on the Continent, was a reformation of theological doctrine as well as of ecclesiastical government and liturgical forms. Such a reformation as was attempted by Henry VIII., a partial reformation of government and ritual, which was to leave the Roman Catholic doctrine entire, could not stand. Under his children and successors, Edward VI. and Elizabeth, the Anglican Reformation became unequivocally Protestant—protesting not merely against the jurisdiction which the Roman Pontiff had usurped in derogation of the rights and sovereignty of the English crown, but against the dogmatic theology of the Roman Catholic Church. The Articles were therefore set forth and established as the doctrinal platform of the reformed Church of England. It was a confession of faith, like the Augsburg confession in Germany—not a *credo* or profession of personal confidence in the Gospel, like the Apostles' Creed or the Nicene, but a confession of faith in the Protestant sense, a declaration and standard of doctrinal orthodoxy. "These confessions of faith," as Dr. Harwood says of the formulas used in our Congregational Churches, "contained, of course, theological propositions, which, when they were prepared, were the full expression of the belief" of those by whom they were prepared and improved. The Articles were a representation of Christianity as it was understood and held by Protestant English theologians in the stormy controversies of the Reformation. Necessarily, therefore, their statements of Christian truth are in the terms, and are molded by the conceptions and forms of "a current system of metaphysics." If there is any such thing as "metaphysical divinity," we have it here; and if our good friend would find a striking illustration of his proposition that "systems of theology are from their very nature subject to the changes which mark all the efforts of the reflecting mind," here it is. If the bishops and leading theologians of the Church of England (the romanizers and the rationalizers being all excluded) could now be called to frame a new doctrinal platform for their

church, and could at the same time discharge their minds of all reference to the platform made three hundred years ago, they might reproduce the substance of the ancient creeds, as given in the first five and the eighth of the Thirty-nine Articles; but in all other points how wide would be the difference between the new confession and the old! The propositions which, in the reign of Elizabeth, expressed clearly enough, and satisfactorily, the religious thought of Protestant England, are now, in the reign of Victoria, hardly intelligible without elaborate commentary, historical and metaphysical, about controversies long ago obsolete. So true is it that scientific theology, as distinguished from the simple facts of revelation, "partakes of the fortunes of all intellectual endeavors," and that "its worth changes with changing times and modes of thought."

For the reason that the Articles were thoroughly and simply Protestant on the theological controversies of the Reformation, and were in fact a declaration of the Protestant theology as the established doctrine of the Church of England, the Puritans, whose desire was to bring the national church to an agreement in discipline and worship with the reformed churches on the Continent,—and even the Separatists, who desired to reproduce in England the unestablished and independent churches of the Apostolic age, had no controversy with them, except as they touch upon matters of government and discipline. But after a while, as always happens in such cases, questions began to arise about the meaning of the Articles; and in one form and another those questions have continued to this day. Meanwhile, every clergyman—high-church, low-church, or broad-church—hyper-Calvinist, moderate Calvinist, Arminian, or Rationalist—Evangelical or Tractarian—subscribes them, accepting them in his own sense, or perhaps in no sense at all, but ever remembering that it is dangerous to contradict them, and that whatever he may think of them in his heart, he must honor them with his lips. Not one of those thirty-nine theses may be freely tested by inquiring what the Scriptures teach. For example, every clergyman who would study in the light of Scripture and of consciousness, the doctrine of what human nature is as affected by sin, must begin and end with the Ninth

Article in full view, and must be sure that he believes it all the while, or, at least, that he does not profess to disbelieve it. The consequence is, that English theology has simply iterated and defended the proposition of the Article as it stands, or has tried to show that it does not quite mean what it seems to mean, or has avoided the discussion of a subject on which the whole science of Christianity hinges. So of other Articles, extremely redolent of the "metaphysical divinity" which Luther and Calvin fought for in the Reformation—the Tenth, the Eleventh, the Thirteenth, and the memorable Seventeenth—an English clergyman, in his character as a clergyman of the Established Church, has no right to doubt whether those propositions, framed in the sixteenth century, express the truth; his whole duty in regard to them is to hold them, to understand them if he can, and to defend them. If we mistake not, the want of free and earnest inquiry into these doctrines has had much to do in bringing to pass the ominous condition of the Church of England at the present time. Dr. Harwood has well described the process, apparently unconscious that he was describing the effect of the Anglican Confession of Faith on the Church of England. He says, referring to the formulas used in our Congregational Churches, "*It has happened with them as with all other kindred documents, that a generation came, and then another, no longer in sympathy with them. What is the natural movement of the mind in this sphere of its action? First, there is indifference; next, there is silent dislike; and, lastly, there is open war.*" The present state of thought at Oxford itself seems very much like an "outbreak." The Colenso case, and the ecclesiastical trials and contentions which have grown out of the Oxford Essays, if they are not "open war," are very much like it.

But what has been the progress of theological discussion in New England. Among us, a clergyman before his ordination, and at each new installation, is examined concerning the theological system which he holds; but there is no prescribed and unchangeable Confession of Faith to be asserted and maintained, on such occasions, by either the examiners or examined. Certain ancient definitions and systems of doctrines are often referred to with becoming respect; but no man is required to

accept them, or any one of them, as having authority over his faith or his teaching. The consequence is that the New England divines, for more than a century, have been discussing, freely and laboriously, the cardinal topics of the evangelical system—such as original sin, the freedom of human actions in their relation to God's predetermining counsel, the atoning work of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the renewing work of the Holy Spirit. We do not claim for the pastors and teachers of New England that they are the most enlightened body in the world, or the most liberal,—we do not forget “the Unitarian outbreak in Massachusetts,” nor that there have been other defections of individuals and of congregations; but we venture to say that, in the history of our New England theology, the conservative spirit, and the progressive, have constantly been helpful to each other. Nowhere is the equilibrium, between the respect for orthodoxy and the desire to receive light from whatever quarter, better adjusted than among our clergy. The truths of the Evangelical system, as revealed in the Scriptures, are held the more steadfastly for being held intelligently, and the more intelligently for being held freely. Nowhere are those great truths more valued than where they are continually derived anew from the facts of the gospel and the words of inspiration, and where the statements and definitions of scientific theology are continually recognized as fallible, and “from their very nature, subject to the changes which mark all the efforts of the reflecting mind,” and therefore fairly open at all times to reconsideration and correction. The hold which those truths have on the Christian consciousness—their intrinsic force in relation to Christian experience—in other words, the attestation which they receive continually from the Holy Spirit, transcribing them, as it were, in the spiritual life of believing souls—is a far better security for them than can be gained by shutting them up, each like a mummy in its sarcophagus, in the logical and metaphysical statements in which they were defined centuries ago, by men who were neither wiser nor better than the wise and good men of to-day.

We come now to the second of what our author regards as the main points of difference between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the pastors and teachers of New England,—namely,

"the terms of communion." His suggestions are worthy of consideration, though we cannot admit that he perfectly understands the principles and practice of our churches in this particular. We will endeavor to exhibit his views distinctly and fairly.

1. He holds, and Congregationalists hold, that some personal profession of faith is a prerequisite of Christian communion. "We plant ourselves," he says, "upon the simple creed of the Church [the Apostles' Creed] as the condition of communion." But, in the Congregational Churches, Christianity has been understood to mean "a scheme of doctrine;" and thus the doctrinal instruction received by the people, and identified with Christianity, "led to confessions of faith, more or less elaborate, which were proffered to candidates for admission into membership with particular congregations, as tests, or conditions, or absolute preliminaries to full communion and fellowship."

We cannot deny that there has been, and is, too much ground for this statement concerning the formulas used in our churches. There has grown up an inconsistency between the Congregational theory and the Congregational practice; and sometimes, though not often, the inconsistency comes out in some painful inconvenience. The first members and guides of the New England Churches were hardly more averse to imposed forms of prayer than to imposed forms for professing faith in Christ. Originally, it seems to have been the privilege of every man, at his admission into a church, to make his profession of faith in his own words, or in such form as he himself might choose; and the church was to judge of its sufficiency. Churches might, nevertheless, have, severally, their own confessions of faith, not imposing them as a test of Christian character or a condition of communion, but only setting them forth by way of testimony to their own members, to other churches, or to the world.* The confession of faith made by a learned divine, and

* Savage's Winthrop, I, 110, 179. Cotton Mather's Ratio Disciplina 88:—*Magnalia II.* 181, (Edition of 1853.) The confession of Faith made by John Davenport at his admission into the New Haven Church,—i. e., at the institution of the church, he being one of the "seven pillars," is still extant; so is the confession of faith made by Daniel Webster, at his admission into the church at Boscawen in New Hampshire.

especially that made by a pastor, at his admission, would naturally be, like Davenport's in New Haven, large and full—a profession, not only of faith, but of theological orthodoxy; and it would as naturally become a model to others entering the same church. After a while there might seem to be something like arrogance or self-conceit in venturing to offer a different form from that which others had adopted, or from that in which the church itself made profession of its faith. In one way or another every church came at last to have its own established form; and the practice crept in of using that form as a sort of test or standard for the trial of those who desired to make profession of their faith.

Yet the *principle* of the Congregational Churches is that a credible personal profession of faith in the gospel of Christ is sufficient as a condition of Christian communion. Strange as it may seem to those, whether Congregationalists, Presbyterians, or Episcopalians—who regard the form of profession used in a given Congregational church, as designed to exclude from communion every one who hesitates at some theological shibboleth which has happened to obtain a place in it, there is hardly any ecclesiastical principle which our churches and our ministers value more than their principle of open communion. Our churches are pædo-baptist, and often the doctrine of infant baptism stands in the formula of profession, yet they rejoice in their freedom to receive Christians who cannot accept that doctrine. Our churches hold, substantially, the Calvinistic view of Christianity, and hold it forth in their formularies and confessions; but we apprehend few of them would dare to reject a candidate for membership simply on the ground of his agreement with Adam Clark and Stephen Olin about the possibility of falling from a state of grace. The instances in which a person desiring to be received to membership in one of our churches stumbles at any clause or phrase in the formula of profession are very rare, but they do sometimes occur; and sometimes when they occur, and the pastor or the Church happens not to know what the principle is which solves the difficulty, they occasion embarrassment, and are got rid of by singular expedients. If, for example, a candidate cannot “frame to pronounce” the phraseology in which the formula expresses

the doctrine of election, he can connect himself with a neighboring Methodist church, and thence pass by letter, without making any new profession, into the very church which he could not enter by profession, because its form of profession was not satisfactory to him.

2. Dr. Harwood tells us, "The [Episcopal] Church does not, it dare not, erect temporary, partial or individual standards of piety, or of feeling, into a public law. It dare not say,—'You cannot approach the Lord's table unless you can state clearly when you were converted.' It demands no *history of the soul*, but simply repentance towards God, the forsaking of evil, and the pursuit of good, according to the divine word." We make no violent inference when we conclude that, in his opinion, the pastors and teachers of New England do what he says the Episcopal Church dares not do. It cannot be denied that, in *some* Congregational churches, some of these things have been done, or attempted—sometimes. The attempt has sometimes been made to set up conventional tests of Christian character, or to make the terms of Christian communion subserve the scheme of some reforming society. We happen to remember a church (outside of New England) in which a dispute having arisen about certain measures undertaken for improving the financial condition of the parish, the majority assumed the responsibility of not admitting any new members who were likely to vote with the minority. But such attempts break down under the steady force of the principle, that evidence of Christian character in a candidate for communion is enough, and is all that any church had a right to require. As for the implication that in the Congregational churches, or in any of them, it is said to those who desire communion: "You cannot approach the Lord's table, unless you can state clearly when you were converted," we will only say that, according to our best knowledge and belief, it is quite unwarranted. In some of our smaller churches the custom exists of hearing from candidates for communion some account of the way in which their minds have been led, and of the reason which they have for thinking that God has effectually "begun a good work" in them. Two hundred years ago, some usage or rule equivalent to this existed in all the New England Churches. It was one of the things which

they had brought with them from old England, where Congregationalism existed only in the form of a persecuted "separation" from what they deemed the formalism and corruptions of the state-church, and where a marked religious experience would, of course, be ordinarily characteristic of those who were impelled by conscience to seek admission into societies which existed in contempt of law, and in which the closest spiritual sympathy was the vital bond of union. The Cambridge Platform of Congregational order (1648) recognizes the existence of this usage, and gives it a qualified commendation. But in the progress of years, the "relation of religious experience" degenerated into a formality, and the custom was gradually abolished by the force of a very obvious principle, namely, that instead of religious experience being a test of religious character, a sound religious character is the sure test of all religious experience. Our friends, we doubt not, will rejoice to be assured that there is not within our knowledge any Congregational Church in which candidates for communion are rejected unless they can state clearly *when* they were converted. We do not know one Congregational pastor or teacher who does not expressly preach in public, and teach in his private intercourse with inquirers, that the question when, or where, or how a man was converted, has very little to do with the reality of his professed conversion; nor one who does not hold that a man may be soundly converted to God, and yet never be able to give, from his remembered consciousness, any psychological account of the process by which he passed from death to life.

3. Dr. Harwood says of the Episcopal Church: "It insists upon the broad renunciation of sin, and the desire to keep God's holy will and commandments in every-day life," as a condition of communion. He says, "We require the *minimum* of spiritual attainments reconcilable with living Christian faith; they [the New England pastors and teachers] require the *maximum*." With all respect for our good friend, and without implying any imputation against the Christian charity of his testimony concerning our brethren, we may be allowed to say in their behalf that his statement of how much spiritual attainment our churches require as a condition of communion is entirely erroneous. We are glad he has made the

statement; for he would not have made it if he had not believed it, and he would not have believed it, if some notion to that effect had not been current among Episcopalians, and particularly among their clergy. The making of the statement in this public manner gives us the opportunity, and imposes upon us the duty, of correcting it.

For the sake of setting this matter in a clear light, we refer to the Cambridge Platform, chapter xii., entitled "Of the admission of members into the Church." We do not see how any serious Episcopalian can dissent from the first proposition of that chapter.

"The doors of the churches of Christ upon earth do not, by God's appointment, stand so wide open that all sorts of people, good or bad, may freely enter therein at pleasure, but such as are admitted thereto as members, ought to be examined and tried first, whether they are fit and meet to be received into church society or not" * * "The officers are charged with the keeping of the doors of the church, and therefore are in a special manner to make trial of the fitness of such who enter."

Nor would Dr. Harwood be willing to have us say that the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country intends to prescribe any lower terms of communion than those which are stated in the second proposition of the same chapter:

"The things which are requisite to be found in all church members are repentance from sin and faith in Jesus Christ; and therefore these are the things whereof men are to be examined at their admission into the Church, and which then they must profess and hold forth in such sort as may satisfy rational charity that the things are there indeed."

On the question whether Congregationalism demands, as a condition of communion, the *maximum* of spiritual attainments, or more than the *minimum* reconcilable with living Christian faith, the third proposition of the same chapter is explicit:

"The weakest measure of faith is to be accepted in those that desire to be admitted into the church, because weak Christians, if sincere, have the substance of that faith, repentance and holiness which is required in church members, and such have most need of the ordinances for their confirmation and growth in grace." * * "Such charity and tenderness are to be used as the weakest Christian, if sincere, may not be excluded nor discouraged. Severity of examination is to be avoided."

Is there, then, in this respect, any difference between the Episcopal Church and the Congregational Churches? We will

not deny that there is. There may be a difference as to what constitutes "the *minimum* of spiritual attainments reconcilable with living Christian faith." The Episcopalian *minimum* may be something less than the Congregational *minimum*. If the former includes nothing more than, first, the grace which N. or M. received when he received his Christian name from his sponsors in baptism, and secondly, the knowledge whereby he "can say the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments, and can also answer to such other questions as in the Short Catechism are contained,"—*that*, in the theory of the New England pastors and teachers, falls below "the *minimum* of spiritual attainments reconcilable with living Christian faith." We do not say that there is just this difference between Episcopalians and Congregationalists as to what constitutes the *minimum*. Our Episcopalian brethren ought to know better than we what that *minimum* is in their view, and we prefer that they should testify. But assuming that in their view the mere fact of having been baptized in infancy, and being able to repeat the answers in the Church Catechism is not, of itself, a sufficient qualification for communion at the Lord's table, we may say that, in our opinion, the main difference between them and us, as to the admission of candidates to full communion, is a difference of administration or discipline. Perhaps we fail to understand the rubrics appended to the Catechism, and the preface in the Order for Confirmation; but we cannot learn from them that anything more than the fact of baptism and the ability to say the catechism is required by the Protestant Episcopal Church, in its corporate capacity, as a condition of being admitted to full communion. Yet, for aught that appears, more than the Church seems to require in the rubrics and preface referred to may be required by the rector or minister of the parish; and we will therefore presume that it is his right and duty, not only to teach and admonish the candidates for confirmation, but also to keep back those who in his judgment are, for any good reason, not "fit to be presented to the Bishop to be confirmed." Under a minister who believes that something which may be taken as evidence of an interior Christian life begun by the work of the Holy Spirit in the soul—something which may be regarded as the effect, and therefore the

evidence, of a penitent and earnest purpose to follow Christ—is the *minimum* of spiritual attainment reconcilable with a living Christian faith, the profession which a young person trained in the Episcopal Church makes at confirmation may mean just what the profession made by a Congregationalist at his admission to full communion means. But if the minister happens to be a mere formalist, who verily thinks that baptism is regeneration by the Holy Spirit, and that additional grace is infallibly conveyed in confirmation, then the candidate may very naturally regard his baptism and his ability to say the catechism as a sufficient *minimum* of spiritual attainment, and may be presented for confirmation without any evidence, or even any consciousness of a pretence on his part, that he knows anything of the “power of godliness.”

To show that the difference in this respect between the Congregational Churches and the Protestant Episcopal Church is essentially a difference of administration, we may cite from the Prayer-book the form of the profession and promise made at confirmation, which is simply a renewal of the baptismal vow and covenant. In baptism, the minister asks: “Dost thou renounce the devil and all his works, the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the sinful desires of the flesh, so that thou wilt not follow nor be led by them?” The response is, “I renounce them all; and, by God’s help, will endeavor not to follow nor be led by them.” At confirmation, the Bishop asks the candidates: “Do ye here, in the presence of God and of this congregation, renew the solemn promise and vow that ye made, or that was made in your name, at your baptism, ratifying and confirming the same, and acknowledging yourselves bound to believe and do all those things which ye then undertook, or your sponsors then undertook for you?” To that question, “every one shall audibly answer, *I do*.” Certainly, if this is not an empty form—if the required response comes as an intelligent utterance from “a good and honest heart”—it does not fall below our Congregational notion of that *minimum* of spiritual attainment which is in our churches the condition of full communion.

Compare, now, with this, the form of words in which the candidate for communion in a Congregational church takes

upon himself the vows of a Christian profession. We cite the form used in a church hard by that in which Dr. Harwood ministers—a form almost *verbatim* the same with that which was used in the same church two hundred years ago. There are more words in it than in the form which we have just quoted from the Prayer-book—perhaps it is too much expanded—but let us see in what particulars it professes or promises more than that.

“Through Christ strengthening you, without whom you can do nothing, you here, in the presence of God, angels, and this assembly, now profess that you do and promise that henceforward you will, deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, wherein in times past you have walked; and you do now give up yourself, soul and body, and all that you have, are, or shall be, unto God through Jesus Christ, to serve him forever, and to be his and at his disposal in all things. And you also give up yourself unto the Lord Jesus Christ, to be his disciple, to be taught and governed by him in all your relations, condition, and conversation in this world, avouching him to be your supreme teacher, your only priest and propitiation, your great king and lawgiver.

“And you do further bind yourself, in the strength of Christ, to walk with this Church in all his ordinances, and with the members thereof in all member-like love and submission.”

The most obvious difference between these two forms respects the recognition of duties which the candidate, thenceforward, owes to the church in which he is received to full communion. In the one there is no distinct recognition of such duties, but is it not assumed and understood that the baptised and confirmed churchman engages to perform the duties of the relation into which he is admitted? In the other form, the engagement to such duties is explicit, which is according to the Congregational theory, but is, nevertheless, consistent with whatever can be regarded as essential to the Episcopal theory. What further difference is there? In the former, the candidate renounces the devil—that is, “the god of this world,” “the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience”—him, “and his works” which Christ came to destroy. He renounces “the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same,” according to that inspired word, “Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world: if any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him: for all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is

not of the Father, but is of the world." He renounces "the sinful desires of the flesh," according to that holy Scripture which describes Christians as the men "who walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit," and which warns us that "the minding of the flesh is death," because it is "enmity against God." His renunciation of these things purports to be a practical renunciation, for it is expressly, and twice over, declared to mean that he "will not follow nor be led by them," and accordingly, at his baptism, he was "signed with the sign of the cross in token that he should not be ashamed to confess the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight under His banner against sin, the world, and the devil, and to continue Christ's faithful soldier and servant unto his life's end." What more than all this do we find in the other form? We have our opinion as to which of the two is preferable esthetically; but of that we say nothing. The only question, at present, is whether, if the form in the Prayer-book professes only the *minimum* of spiritual attainment, the Congregational forms (of which the one we have copied may be taken as a specimen) profess any thing more than that *minimum*.

Yet it must be admitted that unless impressions and opinions in all quarters are very far from the truth, there is in practice a difference between the understood significance of confirmation in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of what is called a profession of religion in the Congregational Churches. We have shown that Dr. Harwood's account of the difference—namely, that while Episcopalianism requires only the *minimum* of Christian character as a condition of communion, Congregationalism requires the *maximum*—is not exactly right. We have shown that the form of words used for the purpose of making a Christian profession has the same meaning in one case as the other, if fairly interpreted. We have suggested that the principle being the same in both cases, the practical difference, be it greater or less, must be a difference in the application of the principle. The principle acknowledged and professed on both sides is that the *minimum* of Christian character which can be regarded as the manifestation of a living Christian faith is a sufficient qualification for communion. The application of the principle in churches of

the Congregational order is such that Episcopalians charge them with requiring too much; while the application of the same principle by the Episcopal clergy is such that Congregationalists are tempted to charge them with requiring too little, even less than the very *minimum* of truly Christian character. In other words, there is an impression, more or less distinct, on all sides, that the personal profession of religion means less in the Episcopal Church than it means in the Congregational Churches. We are sorry for this, and still more sorry if the facts justify the impression. If it be a fact that our churches, through some traditionary error in their administration, exclude, knowingly and willingly, any who ought to be recognized as belonging to Christ, that fact is to be regretted for their sake as well as for the sake of catholic Christianity; and if there is no such fact they are greatly wronged by the misrepresentation. So, on the other hand, if the Episcopal clergy require in candidates for communion no evidence of any spiritual attainment beyond what is required by the letter of the rubrics—if they tolerate in their congregations any traditionary notion as if confirmation were little more than a graceful ceremony very proper for all baptized persons who have attained the proper age, or as if it could of itself work some change for the better in the subjects of it—if the ceremony, under their administration of their parishes, is permitted to have a meaning somewhat like what it has in the Roman Catholic Church, or not much more than it has in the Protestant state-churches of Europe—that surely is an evil to be regretted, because the true welfare of the congregations to which they minister must needs be greatly impaired by such administration, and because the interest of our common Christianity cannot but be injured by the fact—even more than it could be by misrepresentation—that a Christian profession in the Episcopal Church implies, in reality, not even the *minimum* of genuine Christian character. We would respectfully counsel the pastors and teachers of New England to examine this matter carefully, and to take heed lest they, in teaching and guiding their churches, give occasion for the reproach that they exclude from communion those “weak Christians” who, as the Cambridge Platform says, “have most

need of the ordinances." So, on the other hand, if we could be heard by the Episcopal clergy, we would counsel them to guard against the reproach which, in some quarters, justly or unjustly, comes upon them, and to take heed lest "the doors of the churches of Christ" "under their administration," "stand so wide open that all sorts of people, good or bad, enter therein at their pleasure." "Holy things to the holy" is surely a principle sanctioned by catholic antiquity; and no church or body of churches can be spiritually prosperous where admission to communion is not understood to be admission to "the communion of the saints."

In this connection, we are reminded of a fact which we think our Episcopalian friends must have observed, and which they may have observed with satisfaction. We can easily explain to ourselves why it is that, ordinarily, when a person of Unitarian nurture and sympathies, in Boston or its vicinity, is compelled, by a change in his religious convictions, to withdraw from the Unitarian fellowship, he goes over to the Episcopal Church. There was nothing surprising to us in the fact that Dr. Huntington, when he relinquished his professorship at Cambridge and when he finally renounced his connection with Unitarianism, felt himself attracted in that direction rather than towards the Orthodox Congregationalists. In eastern Massachusetts the antipathies and repellencies between the two theological parties are of such a character that it is easier for a Unitarian, when giving up the Unitarian system of opinions, to become an Episcopalian, even of the narrowest sort, than to pass over into full and formal fellowship with "the Orthodox" against whom the current of his prejudices sets with main strength. But how does it happen that when a Unitarian, without any change in his religious opinions or feelings, removes from eastern Massachusetts into Connecticut, where Unitarianism has no ecclesiastical existence, he almost invariably prefers the Episcopal Church in the place of his new residence to the Congregational? Probably he is a man of intellectual cultivation, but it will hardly be denied that the pastors and teachers of New England are as intellectual in their habits, and as capable of intellectual sermons, as any other body of clergy in New England. He may be a man of

literary taste and refinement; but we have yet to learn that in any city of Connecticut, or in the State at large, the Congregational clergy are in this respect inferior to their Episcopal brethren. What then is the sympathy which draws him away from the Congregational church and into the Episcopal? How is it that being still a Unitarian in his opinions and his sympathies, he can endure a method of public worship which includes the General Confession, the *Gloria Patri*, the *Gloria in excelsis*, the *Te Deum laudamus*, the Nicene Creed, and the Litany, when the same thoughts—nay the same words, uttered in the free worship of a Congregational church hardly, would be simply intolerable to his feelings? May it not be that when he hears these Triunitarian and “Calvinistic” things in an Episcopal church he unconsciously apologizes for them? “This is a matter of form: the minister cannot help it: he must read what is in the book: he means no offense, and I will not be offended.” But if he goes into a Congregational church and hears the same sort of things, he understands them in a “Calvinistic” sense and is offended accordingly. If he hears the minister, in prayer, giving glory to the blessed Trinity world without end, or saying “O God the Son, Redeemer of the world, have mercy upon us miserable sinners,—O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, have mercy upon us miserable sinners,—O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons and one God, have mercy upon us miserable sinners,”—he is indignant. He says to himself in that case, “The bigoted Calvinist means it, and means that I shall believe it.” May he not feel in the Episcopal church, that these uncouth forms of speech—uncouth to him—are congruous with the uncouth ornaments of the Gothic architecture with which they have come down from medieval times, and that being forms, prescribed and ancient, they may be regarded as not meaning quite what they seem to mean? And in the Congregational church where there is no book of prescribed forms, and where the minister, in prayer, is supposed to speak from the depth of personal conviction, may he not feel that just the same phrases must needs mean all that they say?

We come then, by this line of thought, to a serious question concerning the mode of worship which distinguishes the Pro-

testant Episcopal Church from other bodies of Protestant Christians in this country—worship in the exclusive use of ancient forms, prescribed and invariable. Does not that mode of worship tend to formalism—that is, to the use of forms without an adequate recognition of the irmeaning—or to an undue reliance upon forms, as if the form were of course the substance? Let it be acknowledged that the tendency, in this respect, of our more advanced Protestantism is to the undervaluing of forms, and that the pastors and teachers of New England, and the churches under their care, should guard against that tendency. Let it be admitted that in our congregations too many persons, to the manifest wronging of their own souls, keep themselves back from the public profession of faith and hope in Christ, and from the visible “communion of the saints,” because the tendency of our system is to an exaggerated notion of the conscious experience essential to a valid profession of a living Christian faith. Let our Episcopalian brethren teach us all they can on this point. *Fas est*—we will not say *ab hoste*, but *a fratre doceri*. But on the other hand, let not our Episcopalian brethren be angry with us if we inquire concerning the possibility that their opposite system may have a tendency to excess in the opposite direction.

Of course, Dr. Harwood, speaking on such an occasion, and on such a theme, could not fail to say something about Episcopacy itself, or, as he styles it, “the threefold ministry.” We have no design, and, at present, no room to argue the old question, whether the government of the churches, by a diocesan episcopacy, is a divine institution that has come down in unbroken succession from the Apostles. Let it suffice for us, in passing, to enter a word of protest against the validity of our friend’s argument, that the beginning of the episcopate “*must* lie in the Apostolic age,” because “otherwise explorers, starting upon voyages of discovery, with another theory, would assuredly be able to fix its date.” Doubtless, if the author had regarded this argument as original, he would have taken pains to make a more ample statement of it, and thus, we think, he would have convinced himself that there is no force in it. The date of what is meant by “the episcopate,” is simply the date of the superiority of the *ἐπίσκοπος* (“bishop”) over the *πρεσ-*

βύρερος (elder) in a particular church. When was that? Few things in ecclesiastical history are better ascertained than that it was not in the Apostolic age. No intelligent person pretends that the *ἐπίσκοποι* ("overseers," *i. q.*, bishops), who were over the Church at Ephesus, were any other than the identical *πρεσβύτεροι* ("elders") who came from Ephesus at the summons of the Apostle Paul to meet him at Miletus (Acts xx. 17, 28); or that "the bishops," who are joined with "the deacons" in the inscription of the epistle to the church of Philippi (Philip. i. 1), and whose qualifications are described in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, were in any way different from the "elders" who were to be "ordained in every church." The time when one of the presbyters, or elders, in a church began to be in some sort set over the others as their president or chief, and to be distinguished from them by the title of *episcopus*, or overseer, is as definitely known as the time when the office of ruling elder, and the distinction between pastor and teacher, became obsolete in the churches of New England. Or, to put it in another form, the "date" of what is understood by "the episcopate," is as definitely fixed as the date of the doctrine of transubstantiation, or of anything else that grew from an unnoticed beginning. If a Papist should argue: "The beginning of the Papacy *must* lie in the Apostolic age; otherwise, explorers starting upon voyages of discovery with another theory, would assuredly be able to fix its date," surely no Protestant scholar would be at a loss how to answer him.

All this, however, is aside from the main purpose, both of the discourse and of our observations upon it. Our author introduces "the constitution of the ministry" as a distinct topic, not for the sake of proving that the Episcopal theory of a "threefold ministry" is apostolic, but rather for the sake of showing "the especial moral significance of the episcopate to the modern man." The argument, as bearing on the legitimate utility of Episcopalianism in New England, is one which deserves a respectful answer. It is to this effect: Prelacy—that is, the diocesan bishop entrusted with the duties of government, not over one parish only, but over many parishes, invested with the exclusive power of ordaining inferior ministers and of administering confirmation, exercising a general oversight, and

recognized as deriving his powers from some mysterious source in the apostolic age—is “a perpetual protest against unauthorized and fanatical assumptions of the ministerial office;” and “it is a fact of history, that when men part with the episcopate, although their opinions touching the ministerial office be reverent, they who succeed them, gradually, yet by well defined steps, relinquish their feeling of its sacredness and of its divine origin; they lower or abandon all conception, in the course of time, of the need of a lawful ordination, and at last deem it a matter of no moment who or whence the person is who may undertake to preach to them.” Undoubtedly, so long as a man is an Episcopalian, he will be slow to recognize any other than the Episcopal way of entrance into the ministry. But is it not equally true that so long as a man is a Presbyterian, he will insist on the Presbyterian mode? Are not Presbyterians as resolute as Episcopalians in maintaining that all ministers must have some orderly vocation and introduction to the ministry? Is a presbytery less jealous of its prerogatives than a bishop of his? Is it not a matter of fact that if a man is a Congregationalist, after the order of the New England Churches, he too, as really as if he were a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, is opposed to any disorderly assumption of the ministry? When a man ceases to be an Episcopalian, the Episcopal Church is thenceforth no longer responsible for his vagaries. If he becomes a Presbyterian or a Congregationalist, nobody blames “the episcopate” for that. If, then, he afterwards renounces the Presbyterian order, or the Congregational, and sets up for himself to be an apostle of disorder generally, a “trance medium,” “the prophet Elijah,” or some self-constituted herald of “the church of the future,” why should his eccentricity or folly be imputed to the want of an episcopate in the system which he has forsaken? Dr. Harwood’s “fact of history” does not happen to be in any history within our knowledge. The earliest Separatists from the Church of England, and their successors, the Pilgrims and other New England fathers, asserted and indulged in their churches the largest “liberty of prophesying.” Every gifted brother among them was a preacher, and they knew nothing of any clerical body or profession. The whole system of arrangements for the examination of those who are

to be preachers, and for their regular introduction to the churches as candidates for the ministry, is the product of experience, tracing out and applying the principle of the communion of churches. The natural tendency in such bodies, starting from first principles, is to order rather than disorder. Any man who will study the history of Methodism may see what the tendency is.

As we understand the "fact of history," it is this: Wherever there is religious liberty, a wide diversity of religious views and of religious forms and institutions is the natural consequence. If all the people in the United States were required by law to be Episcopalians, or if all, without any legal interference, would accept the Protestant Episcopal Church, and worship only at its altars, the "religious notices" published every Saturday in the newspapers of our great cities would be very different from what they now are. But so long as every man or woman who, by dint of advertising or otherwise, can obtain any sort of congregation, is at liberty to preach and to perform public worship in his or her own way, so long we shall probably continue to be disgusted with those Saturday announcements of Sunday performances, which would not be if there were no "unauthorized and fanatical assumptions of the ministerial office." If the episcopate is a standing protest against those things, so is the presbytery; and so is every examination of a young man by an association of pastors to determine whether he is fit to preach for the trial of his gifts, and every council assembled to invest an elected candidate with the sacred office.

After all, is it essential to the lawfulness of preaching that the preacher must be an ordained minister? Was there no such thing as lay preaching in the ancient Church? Was there no such thing as lay preaching in the Church of England, by royal authority, while the Reformation was in progress? Does not the Church of England, even to this day, recognize a distinction between the function of preaching and the functions for which deacons and priests are empowered by ordination? These questions are suggested by the fact that when Dr. Harwood speaks of "unauthorized and fanatical assumptions of the ministerial office," he seems to lose sight of the distinction

between preaching and the administration of sacraments—a distinction quite familiar to four-fifths of the religious people in the United States. We believe that the Protestant Episcopal Church is the only Protestant body within the United States in which no man is permitted to preach who has not been consecrated to the ministerial office by ordination; and even in that church the minister, before he ascends the pulpit, puts off the sacerdotal surplice and puts on the scholastic gown, showing (or seeming to show) that he preaches not as a priest but as a scholar. We make this remark because we believe that in the Presbyterian and Congregational churches there is just about as much repugnance to the administration of the Lord's Supper or of Baptism by a person not ordained to the ministry as there is in Episcopal congregations. That repugnance, stronger to-day than it was two or three hundred years ago, seems to throw light upon the question whether there is just the tendency which our friend thinks he finds in all who do not accept the "three-fold ministry."

Our comments on Dr. Harwood's discourse have been offered not in a captious or contentious spirit, we are sure, nor with any purpose of disparaging the character or the usefulness of the ecclesiastical organization in which he holds a distinguished position. His subject, especially in the latter part of the discourse, is one which invites discussion, and which ought to be seriously considered by Congregationalists as well as Episcopalians. Our hope is that what we have written freely will be kindly received, and will be considered on both sides with a willingness to learn from each other, and to respect each other's work, so far as it is the work of Christ. Therefore, having expressed our dissent, in some points, from Dr. Harwood's reading and interpretation of facts important to his argument, we will not dismiss the subject without guarding distinctly against the possible inference that in our view the Protestant Episcopal Church has done and can do no good in New England. And that we may effectually preclude such an inference, we will set down some points in which the Christianity of New England is indebted, as we think, to that organization.

Let it be frankly conceded that the Episcopal Church is a

constant witness in behalf of decorum and dignity, in the performance of public worship. Holding as we do that the cast-iron stiffness of its prescribed forms is a great disadvantage in worship—feeling as we do with a continually deeper conviction that no forms rigorously imposed and perpetually repeated to the exclusion of all others, can be in the highest degree conducive to edification—sure as we are that ours is a more excellent way—we can at the same time admit that its forms, when well administered, are a constant testimony for a decorous and dignified manner of conducting the service of prayer in a worshiping assembly. Liturgical forms become foolish and even impious in the hands of shallow ritualists, as may be shown by examples fortunately few in this country, but too numerous in England; their weakness is in the facility with which the use of them engenders the habit of regarding religion as one of the fine arts, and introduces a histrionic imitation of worship in the place of worship itself. On the other hand, a mode of public worship in which everything is left to the ability, the taste, and the discretion of the officiating minister, must be in danger of becoming deficient in reverence and dignity of manner, in simplicity of thought and diction on the part of the minister, and in the serious consciousness on the part of the people that the minister, in the act of prayer, is leading them and uttering their requests. Where there is no prescribed form, there is danger that the opposition to formalism may result not only in too much familiarity and perhaps vulgarism of expression on the part of the minister, but also in wandering eyes and listless or otherwise unbecoming attitudes on the part of the congregation. For ourselves, we have no doubt that between these two methods of public worship, the balance of advantages is on the side of free prayer, as distinguished from prescribed forms of prayer. At the same time, we have as little doubt that where the two methods are maintained, side by side, in the same community, each may serve to check whatever tendency to perversion or degeneracy is peculiar to the other. Why is it that the Episcopal Church in this country has on the whole so little of those ritualistic fooleries which disturb and disgrace the Church of England? Are not the tendencies in that direction repressed here, in a great degree, by the religious atmosphere which

everywhere in this country surrounds and influences the congregations that worship according to the book of Common Prayer? If the Episcopal Church gains anything in this respect from our churches, the debt is probably paid in full by the benefits which we derive from the presence—we will not say the rivalry—of that more formal and stately mode of worship which is continually, though indirectly, admonishing our ministers to cultivate the gift as well as the spirit of prayer, and to do what in them lies toward maintaining in the house of prayer the grave decorum and simple dignity of worship.

Let it also be conceded that the Episcopal Church in New England has done something for our churches in the testimony which it has given to the idea of Christian nurture as a means of grace. Unfortunately, in the Prayer-book, and therefore in the prevalent way of thinking among those who use it, the true and Scriptural idea, that the children of the church belong to Christ, and are to be brought up accordingly in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, is mixed up with an erroneous and mischievous doctrine of regeneration by or in the ceremony of baptism. Our clearer and more Biblical doctrine of regeneration by the Spirit "with the word of truth" has sometimes been misunderstood, as if it is implied that regeneration cannot take place, or certainly ought not to be expected, till the mind is sufficiently developed and instructed for a conscious experience of regeneration as analyzed in theology. While our pastors and churches have not neglected the religious teaching of children as a means of storing their minds with truth, which, by the influence of the Holy Spirit, might in due time result in their regeneration, they have been, nevertheless, under a sort of logical temptation to distrust the efficacy of religious training as a means of early regeneration, and almost to doubt the possibility of a Christian life beginning in the tender years of childhood, and growing with all the growth of the intellectual and moral powers.

We believe that the Episcopal Church in New England, even while protesting against our Calvinistic or Hopkinsian doctrine of regeneration, has derived some benefit from the effects of that doctrine, and of others related to it, on the religious life of the community. More than half afraid of what we recognize as

revivals of religion, Episcopal congregations, notwithstanding that dislike, have often felt the glow and movement of such awakenings around them, and have been the better for the influence which they feared. So our churches, on the other hand, (let the concession be frankly made), have been admonished by seeing the confidence with which the Episcopal Church relies on the efficacy of Christian nurture.

Let it be acknowledged, too, that the Congregationalism of New England may learn, and has had some occasion to learn, from the system of the Episcopal Church, the value of the parish as a church institution. Our Congregational churches, especially in the older New England States, were originally the territorial churches of the country. Each church was related to a township or other definite area, for which it was expected to supply religious teaching and the full ministration of the gospel. The officers of the church, and especially its pastor and teacher, were regarded as sustaining an official relation not only to the members of the church in full communion, but to all the inhabitants of the parish. Dissenters from the established order were, after a while, recognized and tolerated; and those of the parochial population who, in the exercise of their religious liberty, enrolled themselves under some other ecclesiastical organization, and undertook to provide for themselves, in their own form, the ministrations of religion, were considered as no longer included in the parish, though the parish itself, as bounded by geographical lines, continued to be, not less than before, the area in which the church was to have the sphere of its special activity, and which it was to fill with religious influences. All this was a matter of course, while the support of religious institutions was required by law; but since the abolition of the *quasi* establishment which made the parish a civil institution, and which undertook to provide that in every such precinct there should be a minister of the gospel chosen by the people and sustained by an assessment, the feeling of territorial relations and duties has been weakened in the churches and in their ministers. In these days it is quite natural for the young pastor to assume that he has the charge not of a parish but only of a congregation; that his "care of souls" is limited to the care of pew-holders or of

those who, of their own accord, attend upon his public ministry; and that he has no parochial duties outside of that circle. The Church, perhaps, falls into the same way of thinking—perhaps it is unwilling that the pastor should “do the work of an evangelist” by expending upon the dwellers in outside school-districts and border hamlets those attentions which the more cultivated and well-to-do people who live in the white houses on the village street would like to receive from their minister. Suppose this tendency to proceed without any counteracting influence, and what will the result be? The old idea of the Congregational church, with its parochial boundaries and its parochial relations and responsibilities, sinks into oblivion, and in its place there comes the idea of churches in cities and large villages, with preaching and music to attract respectable congregations, but leaving to a sort of paganism the hamlets and scattered dwellings that are beyond the reach of the attractive force. Happily the tendency in that direction has been arrested in part. The churches, and the pastors more than the churches, are waking to the duty of parochial evangelization, and are beginning to realize that in addition to all the attractive force that can be concentrated at the place of worship, there must be an aggressive force going out into the highways and hedges, and by persistent invitation and persuasion compelling outsiders to come in. How much Congregationalism may be indebted in this respect to the example and influence of Episcopalianism we need not attempt to determine. We need only say that, in the Episcopal system, the church being always either diocesan or national, the parish institution is necessarily conspicuous, inasmuch as it is mainly the substitute for what in our ecclesiastical system is almost everything. Instead of the local church, with its pastor and deacons and its self-governing brotherhood, the Episcopal system has the diocesan church, with its bishop and clergy and its annual convention; and then it has, under the diocesan authority, the division of the diocesan territory into parishes, each with its church edifice, its wardens and vestrymen, and its rector. The parish is, in its idea, a district bounded by geographical lines; and the ecclesiastical institution of the parish, as conceived of by the Episcopal Church, is the body of arrangements which

the church authorities have made for supplying the people of that district with religious ministrations. Episcopalianism, therefore, is less liable than Congregationalism to overlook the importance of the parish as an ecclesiastical institution. The Episcopal rector, if we mistake not, is more likely than the Congregational pastor to regard the entire population of the parish (obstinate dissenters excepted) as in some sort committed to his care.

We have one more acknowledgment to make in regard to the influence and position of the Episcopal Church among the various ecclesiastical bodies of New England; yet we fear that the acknowledgment, when explained, as we are bound to explain it, may be more painful than pleasing to our Episcopal friends. We refer to the attitude of the Episcopal Church, and its influence over other churches, as a witness for the principle that Christ's disciples in any one place are in fact, and ought to be in form and manifestation, one Catholic church, instead of being (as too often they are) many sectarian churches. Our statement needs explanation. In one view the Episcopal Church is eminently sectarian and exclusive. It holds no intercourse or fellowship with other churches. No minister of any other name, however sound in his views of Christian doctrine, however distinguished by his gifts, however honored and beloved, is allowed to preach in Episcopal pulpits. No Protestant minister of any other connection is recognized as qualified to minister at the Lord's table in the congregations of that order, or anywhere else. This is the exclusive side. In this view the organization is sometimes denounced as almost the narrowest and most unyielding of the schisms that divide and weaken the Catholic Church of Christ in New England. But in another view that organization is, at least, as far as any other from being exclusive or sectarian. It maintains open communion, not indeed with other churches, but with all Christians. All who in any sort profess to believe in Christ are invited to partake at its altars. Other churches may undertake to be "denominational" or eclectic, and to include in their membership only some particular sort of Christians; but the Episcopal Church bears a constant testimony against that kind of narrowness. Its aim is to be the comprehensive church,

and to include among its lay communicants (though not among its clergy) the utmost diversity of opinion and of deportment that can be tolerated without denying the name of Christ. On this side it is all inclusive and catholic, as on the other side it is as exclusive and sectarian. We think it errs in its too easy inclusiveness, but we are sure it errs in its exclusiveness.

How does this happen? The Episcopal Church holds that the Church of Christ is one, and that it is comprehensive of all Christians. So far it is in the right, and on this point it gives a constant testimony. In obedience to this principle it maintains an open communion, inviting all Christians to participation in its sacraments. But at the same time it holds that itself, as organized under its constitution and canons, with its bishops and other clergy, and with its Articles of Religion, and its Book of Common Prayer, is the whole and only Catholic Church of Christ in New England; and that all Christians who do not acknowledge its legislation, and submit themselves to the guidance and government of its clergy in their respective parishes, are nevertheless its members, living (ignorantly perhaps, but really) in a lamentable state of schism. Here is its great mistake; and that mistake, with its logical and inevitable consequences, is what makes Episcopalianism, notwithstanding the catholicity of its aims and pretensions, so exceedingly exclusive and sectarian in its bearing toward all other organizations for Christian worship and communion.

Let all the churches then receive and honor the testimony given by the Episcopal Church to the principle that Christ's disciples in any one place are in fact, and ought to be in manifestation, one catholic community. And let them at the same time take warning from the example of that body, and learn to avoid the error of assuming that any voluntary association of professed Christians under a special system of their own, or of any other human invention, can in any way acquire a right to dictate forms of doctrine or forms of worship to their fellow Christians, in the name of Christ's Catholic Church. Our reference to this false and unfortunate position of the Episcopal Church is not in any bitter feeling. Far from us be every desire to make our brethren of that name odious for what may seem to be an illiberal spirit though in reality it is

not only the result of their traditions but the logical consequence of their principles. We have no lot nor part in any attempt to coerce them by the force of public opinion into some acknowledgment of the validity of other ecclesiastical organizations than their own. Our feeling has long been that the disadvantage of their isolation is greater to them than to us; and those of them who are conscious of embarrassment in an undesired separation from the actual and visible fellowship of the Catholic Church of Christ in New England may be assured of our fraternal sympathy. It is not for us as Congregationalists to exult over their embarrassment; nor to annoy them with courtesies and offers of fellowship which they cannot reciprocate; nor to show them how they may relieve themselves and their ecclesiastical system from the disadvantages of a false position.

POSTSCRIPT TO ART. V., IN THE APRIL NUMBER.

A few words relating to the review of Dr. Beardsley's History, in our last number, will hardly be out of place as an appendix to the foregoing Article.

The author of a communication which seems to have been published originally in the "Connecticut Churchman"—a journal sustaining, if our impressions are correct, some official relation to the Protestant Episcopal diocese of Connecticut—calls us to account for our "language and conclusions" in what we had occasion to say (pp. 293-303, 307) about two historic personages of the last century, "the Rev. Francis Phillips and Col. Caleb Heathcote." Concerning the former he says:

"The Rev. Mr. Phillips was sent as a missionary to Stratford by the Ven. Society, in 1712. His stay was short, and his mission unsuccessful. Our Reviewer says, 'Phillips was a man whose tastes and manners (*and perhaps his morals also*) were entirely out of place in Stratford.' The italics are our own. Now on what evidence does the Reviewer ground the slur which he introduces with a 'perhaps'? That Phillips neglected his duty is unquestioned. But a charge of *immorality* includes, in all persons' estimate, something beyond that, and involves an accusation against private and personal life. And such a charge cannot, we submit, be made, except on the clearest evidence, without violation of the ninth commandment. Nor does such a violation become less wrong, because the person discredited is obscure or has been dead more than a century; nor does it become more honorable because it is sheltered under a 'perhaps.'

"We have as little respect for Mr. Phillips as a minister, as the Reviewer can

have. We believe him to have been unfaithful to his duty, and a self-seeker. And if this is what the Reviewer means, we have only his language to quarrel with. Nine persons, however, out of ten, would imagine that he meant a great deal more; and to this, any man who feels the sacred rights of character, for the dead as well as for the living, may and must object, unless there is evidence as to Mr. Phillips' personal character which is not adduced. If there be not such evidence, the charge involves 'false witness.' It is reckless writing, and common as it may be growing, it ought not to be found on such pages as those of the *New Englander*."

Really this *ensor morum* seems to have a remarkable regard for the rights of character. What reason has he for the suggestion that what we have said about Francis Phillips was without warrant and was "a violation of the ninth commandment?" In our review of Dr. Beardsley's work, we referred to Trumbull's History of Connecticut, and to one particular volume of the Documentary History of New York, as sources of additional information concerning the early attempt to introduce the Church of England into Stratford, and in reference to Phillips we said that Trumbull had not heard of him. If then our censor had turned to the volume from which our information, if we had any, ought to have come, and had looked out the name "Phillips, Rev. Francis," in the index, he would have found all that we know about the person whom he is so ready to vindicate. But instead of taking that trouble he found it easier to suspect us of giving out charges at random, and, on the strength of that suspicion, to charge us with "reckless writing," which "ought not to be found on such pages as those of the *New Englander*." He wants testimony in regard to the morals of Phillips, and he shall have it.

In the "Documentary History of New York," Vol. III. pp. 435-444, is a document entitled "Address from Gov. Hunter's friends to the Bishop of London against the Rev. Mr. Vesey, Circ. 1714." That paper makes two references to the Rev. Francis Phillips, both of them highly significant. Our readers shall have the benefit of them.

First, on pp. 436, 437, the authors say: "It requires men of *exemplary lives*, sound learning, and a mild disposition to gain converts here, or to preserve them when gained, and, God be praised for it, *many* of the missionaries are blessed with these endowments, and have reaped a plentiful harvest in their several districts—but the unhappy conduct of one, Mr. Francis

Philips, lately sent by the Society to Stratford in New England, has on the other hand done an irreparable injury to the established church in a place where there was a very great appearance of its increase." The words in italics (the italics are our own) contain quite as significant an innuendo as was contained in that parenthetical clause "and perhaps his morals also."

Secondly, on p. 439, the writers mention the same unfortunate missionary in these terms: "Mr. Francis Philips, who had deserted his cure at Stratford, and *had done some things here which obliged him to abscond.*" Does not this justify the suggestion that "perhaps" the morals of that missionary were out of place in Stratford at the beginning of the last century? Who, then, is responsible for "reckless writing?"

As for Col. Heathcote, we are quite willing that anybody, after reading the censures which represent us as having greatly wronged him, should simply read over again—or read for the first time—all that we said about the Colonel and the character and tone of his Church-of-Englandism. If Colonel Heathcote does not exhibit himself and his way of thinking and feeling on religious subjects in the voluminous letter from which we gave large and honest extracts, we are mistaken, and are willing to be censured for the error of expressing our opinion on a matter which we thought was fairly before every reader. Yet, in as much as our censor is sensitive on this matter, and takes occasion from it to say some things which are not perfectly good-natured, we will hazard a few words of reply.

Intending to avoid, as far as possible, every imputation on the moral character of the Colonel, and everything which could be construed as denying or doubting the validity of his Christian profession, we imagined a religious and gentlemanly tory of the better class, as tories were in that age—a veritable Sir Charles Grandison, if such a character could have existed so early; and we assumed that this was the picture of Colonel Heathcote at Scarsdale Manor—"a model specimen of the English country gentleman in the reign of Anne—a Sir Roger de Coverly, enlarged and dignified by military experience and by participation in the government of a province." Of this,

our censor says, without a word of specification, that it is "a sketch of the Colonel, *conceived much after the fashion of Gibbon's 15th Chapter*, wherein—as in that—a belittling description, with scarcely a concealed sneer running through it, is made to answer all the purpose of a direct and manly attack."

Now, this is an "attack" on us—designed, perhaps, "to answer all the purpose of a direct and manly attack"; and, perhaps the writer thought that he was doing a direct and manly thing. But he must allow us to say that his attack would have been more straightforward, and would have been more respectable for its manliness, if, instead of merely insinuating that we have assailed the saintly memory of Colonel Heathcote, after the manner of Gibbon's celebrated attack on the Christian religion, he had given some intelligible specification which could be admitted or denied. The expedient of likening an opponent or supposed opponent to some odious heretic or infidel is an easy one—much used, no doubt, in theological and sectarian controversies; but it is not eminently honorable.

Having freely imputed to the Colonel all the virtues and graces which an English gentleman in the age of Queen Anne, free from all taint of sympathy with Puritans and Dissenters, could have desired to claim for himself or his most honored friend, we said that his religious character, as indicated in a very extensive letter to the executive of a missionary society—a letter which we had carefully analyzed and exhibited to our readers—"is of a type that was common amid the general laxity of faith and morals throughout England in those times, and that is by no means extinct on either side of the Atlantic in these days." We proceeded to describe that type of religious character, embodying the general conception in the particular instance. We described it as being essentially that sort of religion in which faith, though it may be real, and though it may be effectual to the saving of the soul, rests, first and constantly, on authority, on tradition, on the church. Will our censor venture to say that there is no such type of Christian character? Will he deny that he personally knows many such Christians? Is it not a favorite doctrine among Anglican divines and would-be Anglicans, that we are to receive the

Bible on the authority of "the Church?" Are there not thousands of devout people, who, if they were asked why they believe the Apostles' Creed, could give no better answer than that "the Church" has taught them to believe it? Has our censor forgotten the convention sermon, so able and suggestive, preached by Dr. Harwood in Bridgeport, in 1862? What wrong have we done to the memory of the illustrious Colonel, by suggesting that he was one of those who believe in Christ, because the church into which they were admitted by baptism, and in which they were nurtured, bears witness to him as the Son of God?

Our censor judges that because Col. Heathcote's long letter to the S. P. G. was commended by us as "methodical and business-like," we must have deemed ourselves "supernaturally gifted," or nearly so, when we suggested that by means of it our readers might "feel themselves pretty well acquainted" with the writer. He "fails to see" that we have "any right" to become acquainted with a man by means of a methodical and business-like letter half as long as the Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Romans, and treating exclusively of matters religious and ecclesiastical. He says further:

"Nor again can we see why any one should expect to find, or by what process, except a strong effort of imagination, our reviewer does find any manifestation of personal religious character, personal faith, or personal experience, in a '*methodical and business-like reply* to certain official enquiries.' There was once, indeed, a school of religionists who paraded prayers and sounded trumpets on all occasions. And there is a method of obtruding religious professions and the most sacred things of the inner life, and mixing them up with ordinary details of business. But God help the world if all the true religion in it is confined to people fashioned on these types."

To all this—which seems as if it might have been written under the irritating influence of these hot days instead of being written, as it must have been, in the mild April weather—he immediately adds that *because* Col. H., in that business letter, "does not enter into any details of personal religious experience," we have "pronounced *ex cathedra*" that his faith was not in Christ first and then in the Church, but in the Church first, and therefore in Christ. Surely this is a muddle. First, our censor insinuates that we belong to the school of the ancient Pharisees, and that we favor the "method of ob-

trading religious professions and the most sacred things of the inner life, and mixing them up with the most ordinary details of business," because, by "a strong effort of imagination," we do find in a certain document a manifestation of "personal experience." Then, in the next breath, he declares that we pronounce our unfavorable judgment on the writer of that document for the very reason that we do *not* find in it the very thing which just before we were condemned for finding, and he insinuates that therefore we are to be identified with "certain schools of religion," the same perhaps with which we were to be identified for finding that which he now says we did not find. But out of this confusion rises the prayer, "God help the world if all the true religion in it is confined to people fashioned on these types." We say *amen!* and say it the more readily, because we have slight respect both for the school of the old Pharisees and for the method of mixing up the most sacred details of the inner life with ordinary details of business; and also because we have expressly assumed that the tory Colonel, notwithstanding the traditionary nature of his faith, was an instance of "true religion."

Our censor makes another point. He says, "Col. Heathcote is condemned because 'certain political principles were part of his religion,'" and then he professes "surprise at finding the NEW ENGLANDER objecting to a connection between political and religious principles." It would probably be of little use to tell such a writer that he misunderstands us, for it seems likely that, whether through our fault or his own, he will in some way misunderstand us still. But a few words may make this matter clearer to other readers. We did not "condemn" Col. H. on the ground alleged. When we said that "certain political principles were part of his religion," we said it by way of apology for him, and not by way of condemnation. Nor have we "objected" at all "to a connection between political and religious principles." One might almost as wisely object to a connection between magnetism and electricity. Questions of political economy, simply as such, have little connection with religion; but let it be forever understood and everywhere proclaimed, that religion has much to do with questions in the higher walk of politics. Questions

of political ethics, like all other ethical questions, are within the legitimate sphere of religion. The rights and duties of individuals in civil society, the divine right of government in the state, the limits within which civil government has rightful power over its subjects, the sacredness and the extent of religious liberty, the right of property in all its relations to the individual and to society, the right of personal liberty, the sacredness of the family and especially of the conjugal relation, the right of parents in their children and of children in their parents—these highest and most momentous themes of politics are transcendently religious. Often the test of religion in one type or another, the proof of its unsoundness, may be in its relation to such questions. The religion which sanctioned and sanctified the political doctrine that the people of the English colonies in America were to be governed by Great Britain, and in the interest of the British people, was, so far forth, a bad religion. The religion which had no word of rebuke or abhorrence for the countless and ineffable crimes that made up the institution of slavery as it existed so lately in the United States—our censor knows where to find such a religion, or certainly where he could find more than enough of it five years ago—the religion which, without evidence enough to hang a dog, found all negroes and mulattoes guilty of being descended from the father of Canaan, and therefore doomed and devoted them to be sold in the markets like “dumb and driven cattle”—was, and is yet, wherever we may find it, a bad religion. The religion which concerns itself with questions of ritualism and of sacerdotal millinery, with green boughs at Christmas, and flowers at Easter, and with questions about the orientation of churches and the intoning of prayers, but will not soil its dainty fingers with the handling of questions concerning right and wrong in the relations of human society, and is careful not to impair the self-respect of criminals plotting and scheming in the interest of political wickedness, and blessing themselves, meanwhile, in the name of the Lord—is a bad religion. Nor is it any better if instead of occupying itself with the trumpery of ritualism, it dwells among the dry bones of scholastic metaphysics, or expatiates in airy flights of imagination and feeds on sentimental fancies.

Whatever form it may take, the religion which is too transcendental, too abstract, too frivolous, or too timid, to assert the paramount authority of God's law over all human relations and in every sphere of human activity, is salt which has lost its savor. Religion and politics are inseparable. Bad politics, if not exorcised in the name of Christ, and held up to condemnation in the light of God's justice, will make bad religion. So, on the other hand, a corrupt or misguided religion, lending its influence even silently to the sanction of wickedness in civil relations, makes bad politics; and the "evil men and seducers" in such unholy alliance—the Honorable and the Reverend or Right Reverend—the men of the caucus and the men of the church, bowing complaisantly to each other—"wax worse and worse."

We beg our readers, therefore, to understand distinctly that we do not object to a connection between political and religious principles. We hold that such connection is inevitable and inseparable, and that "the Son of God was manifested that he might destroy the works of the devil" in the sphere of civil relations, and civil rights and wrongs, as well as in every other sphere of human interests and duties.

ARTICLE IV.—PROFESSOR FISHER'S LIFE OF BENJAMIN SILLIMAN.

Life of Benjamin Silliman, M. D., LL. D., Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy, and Geology in Yale College. Chiefly from his Manuscript Reminiscences, Diaries, and Correspondence. By GEORGE P. FISHER, Professor in Yale College. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. 2 vols. 12mo.

THE lesson which the lives of most men seem designed of God to teach us is that of the imperfection and incompleteness of this world. They are so hindered in their work, and beset with sorrows and trials, and filled with a thousand limitations, and even broken off in years before the end, that, as we look upon them, one by one, they become to our view a mass of fragments only, almost useless in themselves, except as they point to a more perfect future; and the wonder of divine wisdom and power is that they can be taken up into one far-reaching plan, and made to form the progressive history of the ages. But now and then, at rare intervals, a life is lived which is full and complete on every side,—one which is strikingly marked in its peacefulness and success, in the fulfillment of all its purposes, and in the continual happiness of all its years, from earliest youth to the ripeness of old age—the spirit passing away at the last, with the confidence of triumphant faith and hope, into the glories of the unseen world, only after it seems to have gathered to itself, in most abundant measure, every blessing that this world could give for its enjoyment. In the vision of such a life we lose sight, for the moment, of disappointment and imperfection, while there are revealed before us, as if from heaven, the possibilities of our human nature even here, as they might have been if sin had not brought its train of evils upon our race, and the earthly history had been only the beautiful opening of an immortal existence. We have been often impressed with a thought like this, in times past,

as we have reflected upon the story of that most wonderful and illustrious course through which Washington was led on to the accomplishment of his great work—the greatest in the history of civil liberty—and have seen how perfect, at every step, was the fullness of his life and being. Beyond the work which was assigned to him of God, and for which he so manifestly was raised up as the means of securing God's gift to the world, there was in himself—in the progress of his career as viewed in itself—something that seemed like a display before mankind of the perfection of the divine workmanship, of the possible beauty of the divine creation. A man of far different powers, indeed, from Washington, and destined for a widely different work, in a much more limited sphere, but yet a man whose long life of more than eighty years exhibited somewhat of a similar outward completeness, was the one whose record of his own course is given in the volumes before us. As the tidings of his death came to us two years ago, on the day of national Thanksgiving, and our thoughts were turned backward to the past—to think of the manly beauty of his person, and the quiet joy of his home, and the brilliant success of his working; of the ingathering upon him, during so many years, of honors and rewards, and the freedom of his life, in so large a measure, from the sorrows allotted to most men, and the buoyant hopefulness that had always sustained his cheerful spirit; of the green and fresh and hearty old age, which shone so brightly upon all around him, and rejoiced so greatly as it laid aside the burdens that had been borne for half a century, and the happy death which seemed, in the time and manner of its coming, to be the crowning gift of heaven, even above all that had preceded it, and the Christian hope, with which no painful doubt was mingled, that the brightness of the past was only fading away before a greater and ceaseless joy and light in the future—it seemed as if our thanksgiving might fitly rise to the Divine Father, that he had caused to be lived, even in our presence, so large a portion of so full a life, and that, amid the sorrow which comes so constantly as friends are passing away around us, whether in youth or age, because their work and course are really unfinished, here was one life over whose ending we could only rejoice, in the thought that

it was perfectly and beautifully finished. And whatever may be said of the record that now lies open to the reader for his perusal and his judgment, in other respects, we cannot but believe that every one will sympathize with us in the same feeling as the life here displays itself, and will acknowledge this wonderful outward completeness, which appears in the story as it did in the career itself.

It would be impossible for us, within the limits of a short Article like the present, even did we desire to do so, to follow out the details of the story in such a way as to impress our readers with the completeness of which we speak. To do this would be to repeat the narrative as it is given by Professor Silliman himself. We can only call attention briefly to the course of his life, to the work which he accomplished, and to some of his characteristics, and hope that we may thereby do something to awaken pleasant recollections in the minds of many who knew him in years past, while at the same time we commend to them the work before us, if they would see him as he was. Those who thus, by the perusal of these volumes, refresh their memory of his character and life, we are sure will rise from their reading with a just appreciation of the man.

Having been born in 1779, he came forward into life as a young man just at the opening of the present century. Yale College had, at that time, recently passed under the direction and guardianship of President Dwight, and was opening towards a new career of usefulness and prosperity. Up to this period—during the first century of its existence—it had been little more than a high school under another name. Illustrious men had, indeed, presided over it at different times, and it had fulfilled, in a satisfactory manner, the noble design of its founders, in preparing large numbers of educated youth for the ministry of the gospel. But the possibilities of the age, in the way of broad culture and large ideas of learning, were then of necessity very limited; while the thought of any instruction beyond that of one permanent officer surrounded by a continually changing body of Tutors seems scarcely to have entered the mind of any one. The new era, with the rapid growth of the country which was already commencing and

giving prophetic assurances of the future, was bringing a new demand for literary institutions of a higher order, and offering the reward of the first rank and the widest celebrity to those who earliest saw and met the need. Probably no man ever appeared at an opportune moment, who was more admirably fitted for the work to be done, than was Dr. Dwight. With a mind open to the value and the glory of knowledge in every line,—with a wisdom that grasped not only the small things of the present but the great things of the future, laying its plans ever with an outlook far beyond the limits of his own lifetime or even the thoughts of ordinary men,—with a heart large enough to take in the interests of all who might be called to labor with him, though in fields far different from his own, and generous enough to sustain them by his sympathy and encouraging counsel or assistance,—and with a power of discovering the excellences and adaptations of other men, which was especially essential in one whose office it was to raise up a company of youthful associates for an untried work, he seemed to have been sent of God from his retired parish at Greenfield Hill to bring about a new creation—to change the school of the past into a College, and lay the foundations of what should be a great University in the time to come. The class of which Mr. Silliman was a member was the second that was graduated under Dr. Dwight's administration. Doubtless even at that early day, the President's discerning mind had seen the promise of the youth before him, but when, a few years later, the young graduate had successfully discharged the duties of the Tutorship, it became more manifest that there were possibilities within him which might be of incalculable benefit to the institution. It is evident from the simple narrative before us, that the needs of natural science as a part of college education had been, for a considerable period, a subject of much thought with Dr. Dwight, and that he had been devising the means, as well as urging upon the Trustees of the College the importance of providing a permanent teacher in this department of learning. That it was done with an especial energy at this time, because he saw at hand a man to whom he believed the interests of Natural Science in the College could be wisely committed, and with a fixed resolution in

his own mind that he should be retained in the College service if possible, is equally clear. But those who know much of the slow movements by which alone changes can be made, and even the most necessary steps in advance can be taken in our great educational institutions,—far slower, probably, sixty years ago than now,—will only wonder that the youth had not passed away into another field of labor and become so established in some other profession as to be no longer at the call of the College, before the necessary funds could be provided for the new Professorship. As we, at this remote day, look back over the finished career and trace out all that was accomplished during its many years, we can only see the Divine guidance and the Divine blessing attending the efforts of that great man, whom the Divine wisdom had already inspired to appreciate the demands of the coming age, and to meet those demands by such a wise selection. The narrative here has so important a bearing upon Mr. Silliman's life, while, at the same time, it gives so clearly the views and thoughts of Dr. Dwight, that we feel justified in making an extract of some length, for the purpose of calling it more distinctly to the reader's attention. After a brief review of the condition of things with regard to physical science in the College at the close of the last century, when, to use the language of the writer, "Chemistry was scarcely ever named," and after the setting forth of a proposal, which was made to him, to take charge of a large academy near Savannah, in Georgia, in connection with which he was assured that he might find the means of establishing himself successfully in his chosen profession of the law, Mr. Silliman proceeds as follows:

"While I was deliberating upon this important subject, I met President Dwight, one very warm morning in July, 1801, under the shade of the grand trees in the street in front of the college buildings, when, after the usual salutations, we lingered, and conversation ensued. He had been a warm personal friend of my deceased father; and their residences being but three miles apart,—Holland Hill and Greenfield Hill, both in Fairfield,—an active interest was maintained between them and their families. The President having ever, and particularly since his accession to the presidency in 1795, taken a parental interest in my brother and myself,—my brother Gold S. Silliman and myself were classmates,—I felt it to be both a privilege and a duty to ask his advice on this occasion. After I had stated the case to him, he promptly replied, and with his usual decision said: 'I advise you not to go to Georgia. I would not voluntarily, un-

less under the influence of some commanding moral duty, go to live in a country where slavery is established; you must encounter moreover the dangers of the climate, and may die of a fever within two years. I have still other reasons, which I will now proceed to state to you.' He then proceeded to say that the corporation of the College had, several years before, at his recommendation, passed a vote or resolution to establish a Professorship of Chemistry and Natural History as soon as the funds would admit of it. The time, he said, had now arrived when the College could safely carry the resolution into effect. He said, however, that it was, at present, impossible to find among us a man properly qualified to discharge the duties of the office. He remarked, moreover, that a foreigner, with his peculiar habits and prejudices, would not feel and act in unison with us, and that however able he might be in point of science, he would not understand our college system, and might therefore not act in harmony with his colleagues. He saw no way but to select a young man worthy of confidence, and allow him time, opportunity and pecuniary aid to enable him to acquire the requisite science and skill, and wait for him until he should be prepared to begin. He decidedly preferred one of our own young men born and trained among us, and possessed of our habits and sympathies.

"The President then did me the honor to propose that I should consent to have my name presented to the Corporation, giving me at the same time the assurance of his cordial support, and of his belief that the appointment would be made. I was then approaching twenty-two years of age,—still a youth, or only entering on early manhood. I was startled and almost oppressed by the proposal. A profession,—that of the law,—in the study of which I was already far advanced, was to be abandoned, and a new profession was to be acquired, preceded by a course of study and of preparation too, in a direction in which in Connecticut there was no precedent. The good President perceived both my surprise and my embarrassment, and with his usual kindness and resource proceeded to remark to this effect: 'I could not propose to you a course of life and of effort which would promise more usefulness or more reputation. The profession of law does not need you; it is already full and many eminent men adorn our courts of justice; you may also be obliged to cherish a hope long deferred, before success would crown your efforts in that profession, although, if successful, you may become richer by the law than you can by science. In the profession which I proffer to you there will be no rival here. The field will be all your own. The study will be full of interest and gratification, and the presentation which you will be able to make of it to the college classes and the public will afford much instruction and delight. Our country, as regards the physical sciences, is rich in unexplored treasures, and by aiding in their development you will perform an important public service, and connect your name with the rising reputation of our native land. Time will be allowed to make every necessary preparation; and when you enter upon your duties, you will speak to those to whom the subject will be new. You will advance in the knowledge of your profession more rapidly than your pupils can follow you, and will be always ahead of your audience.' Thus encouraged by remarks so forcibly put and so kindly suggested, I expressed my earnest and most respectful thanks for the honor and advantages so unexpectedly offered to me, and asked for a few weeks for consideration and for consultation with my nearest friends. We then emerged from under the shade of

those noble elms, and I retired, thoughtful and pensive, to my chamber. The confidence reposed in me by President Dwight, and thus tendered in advance, increased my sense of responsibility in view of a highly important and arduous undertaking. I felt it, however, to be a relief to escape from the practice of the law, which never appeared to me desirable. There are, indeed, bright spots in a career at the Bar; right may be sometimes vindicated against wrong, and injured innocence protected; but the temptation would often be strong—especially when backed by wealth—to contend against justice, and by force of talent and address to make the worse appear the better cause, and to screen the guilty from punishment, the fraudulent from the payment that is justly due. If one could always be engaged in a good cause, and could be at liberty to follow the promptings of his conscience, without suppression or perversion of truth, or concealment or palliation of wrong, then indeed the practice of law would appear most desirable and honorable; and with requisite talent and learning, and the impulses of a generous temperament, a career at the Bar might be truly noble; but having been a diligent and attentive listener in the courts of law during my course of study of the profession, I had seen that the *beau idéal* sketch was too often merely a picture of the imagination. The associations which the practice of the law creates are often highly undesirable. Often the most unworthy part of mankind throng the courts of justice, or are compelled to appear there by the mandate of law, and the practising lawyer is obliged to consort with the weak and the wicked, as well as with the wise and good. Such were some of the thoughts which occurred to me on the first view of the question of changing professions. On the other hand, the study of Nature appeared very attractive. In her works there is no falsehood, although there are mysteries to unveil, which is a very interesting achievement. Everything in Nature is straightforward and consistent. There are no polluting influences; all the associations with these pursuits are elevated and virtuous, and point towards the infinite Creator. My taste also led me in this direction, and I anticipated no sacrifice of feeling in relinquishing the prospect of practice at the Bar, although I had no occasion to regret that I had spent much time in the study of the noble science of the law, founded as it is in sound reason and ethics, and sacred to the best interests of mankind."

No one can read this long passage—which indeed will be familiar to his friends and pupils, who have heard the story from his own lips—without observing how, in those early days, at the very outset of its new life, the plan of the college, which has since been followed with so much success, was formed in the mind of its President. He saw that the true course was not to go abroad for teachers in any department, for the simple reason that foreigners, through want of comprehending our system or the character of American youth, could not generally be capable of giving them the most valuable instruction,—nor, again, to call in men of advanced years who had acquired more or less of reputation in some other line, but who, by their very success elsewhere, had become disqualified for a pro-

fessor's chair,—but to train up in the college itself its own officers, educating them for their work and looking confidently to the future for their reputation and extensive usefulness. And probably in no one thing was his wisdom more conspicuous, or the course which he pursued more highly advantageous, than in this. He established, once for all, the traditions and customs for the institution, and proved by the results of subsequent years—when the young men, whom he had chosen had become illustrious throughout the country or the world—the correctness of his judgment not only in his choice of individuals, but in his general views and arrangements. Yale College, in its whole history since his accession to his office—in its prosperity and in its carrying forward of the cause of sound learning—is a standing refutation of and protest against the views of those who measure all things by mere present outward fame, or of those who would call in, from every quarter, men whose chief recommendation is that they are said to be “alive” to the greatness of the age, or are able to electrify a popular audience by their eloquence. The scholars of Yale College—and they have been unsurpassed by any in the country—have been, from the beginning, the men who have grown up within her own limits; and everything which the country owes to Yale College, it owes to these scholars, who began their work as young men, and, turning aside gladly from the rewards of the outer world, gave themselves for life to the service of the institution and of letters,—waiting patiently, on the one hand, for the acknowledgment of their labors when the time should come, and resisting manfully, on the other, every incoming of mere pretenders or of the false show that deceives so many. The name of Benjamin Silliman, if it means anything, will always be to the reader of American literary history the clearest proof, that the way to success in any field of labor or of study is to give the whole life to it, from the years of opening manhood to the very end, and that the welfare of a college is best secured by the wisdom of those who live within it, and not by the theories of those who look on only from outside its walls.

We cannot wonder that the young student, not yet arrived at the age of the majority of our graduating classes of to-day,

should have been "startled and even oppressed by the proposal," or that, after the interview, he should have "retired thoughtful and pensive to his chamber." But the reflections that followed were just what we might have anticipated from such a mind and character as his. The temptations which so frequently assail the lawyer and lead him to violate, in greater or less degree, his sense of right and justice, and the by no means elevating influence of the class of men with whom he is often, of necessity, brought in contact, must have presented themselves vividly to his thought, as he set the profession which he had chosen for himself and the one which his revered friend had chosen for him side by side. It could have required but little time for a soul of such childlike purity to decide where the attractive pathway lay; and we can almost hear him saying to himself, in the retirement of his own room, "In Nature's works there is no falsehood. Everything is straightforward and consistent. There are no polluting influences. All the associations are elevating and virtuous, and point towards the infinite Creator." Thoughts like these, and consultation with his friends, brought him to a decision to accept the proposal which had been so unexpectedly and so kindly made. A year elapsed, however, before the final steps were taken. It was at the College Commencement, in September, 1802, that the Corporation voted to establish the new Professorship, and in accordance with the wishes of the President elected Mr. Silliman to fill the chair. It is difficult for us at this day,—when all departments of Natural Science are pressing themselves upon the public attention, and attracting to themselves large numbers of educated young men from year to year, who find everywhere the largest facilities for the prosecution of their chosen studies,—to realize in any measure what the youthful Professor had to do in preparation for his work. The story seems like the dream of a distant age, instead of being the simple facts in the early life of a man whom for years we ourselves knew and honored. And in the estimate not only of what he accomplished for Science, but of what he was in the powers and capabilities of his own mind, we cannot justly lose sight of the condition of things when the responsibilities of his office were thrown upon him. There may be men

in the future, who will find grander opportunities and do what seems to be a more magnificent work, than those who first opened the way for the higher education in our land two generations ago, but let it never be forgotten that they were creators, as it were, of everything upon which the labors and fame of other men are founded, and that the true glory of the full-grown University in after times is to be, in no small degree, to the praise of those far-seeing minds and earnestly enthusiastic souls who prepared, in the day of small things, the way for all the future progress.

Our limits will not allow us to give the narrative of Mr. Silliman's residence in Philadelphia, preparatory to his entrance upon his professorship, nor to speak of his early efforts in establishing his department upon a permanent foundation, with all needed facilities for instruction and experiment. It is enough to say, that his mind seemed to open at once to the requirements of his position, and to see the demands both of the present and the future. The essential importance of study abroad, if he was to make Chemistry and the other sciences assume their proper place in the College course, became manifest to him at an early day. Accordingly, in 1804, when the President and Fellows had determined to appropriate a considerable sum for the purchase of books for the library and of philosophical and chemical apparatus, he hastened to Dr. Dwight, and suggested the plan of securing the object proposed by sending himself to Europe, instead of employing a foreign agent. The plan was favorably listened to, and, on consultation with the managing Trustees of the institution, was immediately adopted. In March of the following year he set sail for Liverpool. With every facility for the prosecution of his studies, and with a soul fully awake not only to the opportunities of scientific acquisition, but to the elevating and liberalizing influences of a residence in the Old World, he passed a year in England and Scotland, and then returned with new energy to his work in the College. From this time forward, for fifty years, he pursued his even course in the Academic life, speaking to successive classes with an inspiring enthusiasm of the truths and mysteries of Nature, and never failing to point them, in all his instructions, to that infinite Creator whose presence he

had felt, at the beginning, was everywhere manifested in Nature's works. As a Lecturer upon Science within the College walls, he was, according to the universal testimony of the oldest graduates, a man of rare excellence. With a new subject and a heart full of love for it,—with a most pleasing address and a wonderful command of language, he had the pleasure, which few Professors under our compulsory collegiate system ever enjoy, of seeing all his audiences interested and delighted. He was enabled to impress upon them truths and facts of which they had never dreamed before, and so to extend their field of vision, as they looked out upon the world around them, that wonders hitherto unseen became familiar to their thought. Their life seemed to them to be enlarged by what they gathered from his instructions, and, as with the joy of a new treasure, they carried away what he revealed to them, never to forget what they had learned or the teacher from whom they had learned it. The students who listened to him, during the last ten or twenty years of his active life, can scarcely imagine the effect produced upon their predecessors in the earlier period,—for, largely owing to his own efforts, the knowledge of Natural Science had, by that time, been so widely spread abroad among the community, that the things once new had become old and well-known, and a portion of the charm had consequently passed away. But the graduates of the years preceding 1820 no more easily failed to remember what he taught, than did the graduates of the years following 1840 lose from their recollection the beauty of his manly face and form.

Of the work which Professor Silliman did for the College, no adequate estimate can be made. In his own department,—the field of Natural Science,—the change from the nothingness of the days when he had the memorable interview with President Dwight to the present development and prosperity of the great Scientific School, which forms a vigorous part of the University, though not entirely due to his efforts, may seem a kind of outward representation of what he accomplished. But when we try to measure the influence which he exerted upon individual minds among the students, or the service to the cause of learning here which his constant and faithful labors in his own chair rendered for so many years, or the power which his presence in its

Faculty gave to the College far and wide, or the aid which his dignified person and eloquent appeals afforded it, when its claims were to be presented before its graduates or the public or the State—the most careful searching into the history of the past or even of the future can never make all this fully known. We would not compare him, indeed, with the other noble and faithful men who were his fellow-laborers in the instruction and government of the College. They were all admirably qualified for the peculiar sphere and work to which they were called, and, in a remarkable manner, their different powers and tastes answered to and supplemented each other. They were some of them men of greater genius, doubtless, than he was, and more adapted to the severer studies and deeper philosophical investigations. But it is hardly too much to say that, for forty years, he was perhaps the man of widest reputation among them all—a reputation which extended through all classes of his own countrymen and even far beyond the boundaries of his native land. Multitudes of persons, doubtless, knew of the existence of Yale College more from the fact that he was in it, than from any other cause, and multitudes more, who had never seen or heard him, had learned from his widespread fame to think of him as one of the great men of the time. The many hundreds also of young men—more than two thousand even—who were educated here during his term of service, mingled with their joyous recollections of New Haven their reverence for him, and to every one among them his presence was a part of their college life. The very celebrity of such a man, when it has all been gained within its borders or in its service, is in itself a treasure of incalculable value to the University where his life is passed.

The personal reminiscences which the volumes contain, we regret to say, extend, so far as the College is concerned, only to the history of the growth of his own department. They tell the well-known story of the candle box in which he carried the whole cabinet of minerals belonging to the institution to Philadelphia in 1803; and of the first effort at preparing a laboratory, which, being arranged under the direction of the well-disposed, but (on this subject) ignorant Trustees, was almost useless until he could prepare it anew; and of the munificent of-

fer of the Gibbs collection, at a later day, which, as it was placed on the College grounds, became a center of attraction for both students and strangers, and excited much enthusiasm for the science which it represented. They also set forth the progress of his own work, as he steadily pursued his labors from year to year, seizing upon every opportunity for new acquisitions, and pressing the claims of all the sciences committed to his care. The development of the College itself in this respect is thus given, in considerable measure, and perhaps as fully as could be expected or desired. We had hoped, however, before the volumes appeared, that they would contain more than this. It will be remembered that Mr. Silliman's professorial life covered all the years from the early beginning of Dr. Dwight's presidency to the close of 1864—the entire period since the College began to enlarge itself toward the demands of the present age. Rarely, if ever, has the history of a single individual been thus coincident with the history of a great public institution, through so many years and so many changes. In looking forward to the publication of the Autobiography, therefore, and in entering upon the perusal of it after it had been published, we could not but anticipate great pleasure in reading much of the history of the College as viewed from the standpoint of his own mind—as traced out by him, when he turned his thought backward over his past career and recalled to his memory his own feelings at the time of past events or his own knowledge of the circumstances that must, of necessity, be unknown to other men, except from the testimony of those who had gone before. The value and interest of such a *personal history*, if we may so call it, of Yale College to every one interested in its progress and welfare can scarcely be overestimated, and we were naturally led to expect that it would be given in this work. But we are sorry to say that nothing of the kind is to be found. From a desire to limit himself to what related to himself or from some other reason, he passes over all these details of the past, and we discover hardly anything of what he had seen and known in the general life of the College, during the fifty years of his continuance in his professorship. Even the change of the presidency of the institution from Dr. Dwight to Dr. Day—one of the most memorable

crises in the whole history of the College—is altogether omitted, and nothing is said of the steady advancement of its interests or the increase of its departments after that time. And so throughout both the volumes, the life of Yale College, as seen through the mind and thought of this venerated officer, is nowhere manifest, as we could have wished. The spirit of fault-finding is not a pleasant spirit, and it is a spirit which one especially might not desire to indulge when within the presence of so genial and kindly a man as Professor Silliman was. But the expression of regret, we trust, is not unfitting,—regret that his enthusiasm for his own studies, or his modest limitation of himself to a story for his own family, or the absorbing influence of other things, or some other cause, kept him from giving out from the storehouse of his memory what would have been of so much worth to hundreds or thousands of his readers. An autobiography, it may be said indeed, is, almost from its very nature, wholly centered upon the man himself, and these volumes make up an autobiography. But, in this case, the life of the individual was so coincident with and intertwined in the life of the College, that whatever the author might have told us, as from his own observation, would have scarcely passed the limits of the narrative of himself. Our regret, however, is unavailing now, and as we have dwelt upon the point, perchance, too long already, we leave it with these words. It is one of the honors of Professor Silliman's life, that, while the history of his own career can thus be written without giving, with greater fullness, that of the institution where he labored, the history of the College, on the other hand, even in the remotest future, can never be written at all, without including the record of his life and work.

As we turn aside from this brief consideration of what he did in his special sphere as a college officer, to speak of his service to the cause of science in general, and thus to the world, we feel a peculiar embarrassment in that our own duties in life have called us into another field. But the especial service which he rendered, as well by reason of the peculiarities of his mental gifts as because of the peculiarities of the time in which his life began, was one that could be appreciated, in a great measure, by all educated and thoughtful men of every

profession. We can allude to it only in a few words. Professor Fisher opens his work by describing him as "the most eminent of American teachers of Natural Science." If we compare him with the most distinguished scientific men of the present time, in many respects, this, of course, could not be said of him. The state of scientific knowledge, either in this country or in Europe, did not admit of his becoming so, nor do we suppose that, even had he commenced his course with the advantages of to-day, he would have taken precisely the same position with some who might easily be named. In another sense, however, the description is a true one. He did so much by his celebrated courses of lectures in the various larger cities of the country, and by his publication of the *American Journal of Science*, to bring these hitherto unknown branches of learning to the knowledge of the whole people, that everybody became acquainted with his name and fame. Men who would have been, perhaps, altogether unable to appreciate the investigations of many prominent scholars in these departments, at the present day, or who would have passed them by with scarce a thought of their value to the world, felt that Professor Silliman was a great public benefactor and a real teacher of mankind. And those, on the other hand, who could properly estimate everything in the work of others, gave him the peculiar praise which belongs to men who lead the way and are pioneers. All classes, therefore, alike acknowledged his services, and he had a reputation, as compared with his contemporaries and his younger associates and followers, if not the highest with some, yet the most universal with all. The *American Journal* was established in 1818, and was conducted, in whole or in part, by him for a period of about thirty years. The results accomplished by this single work,—a work, it must be remembered, altogether outside of the duties of his official position,—are enough in themselves to have made his life a more than commonly useful one; and the energy and enthusiasm with which he undertook it and carried it forward, even at times amid many discouragements, show that he was no ordinary man. He had that peculiar power, which is found in those who most help the world forward in its course—the power of seeing the necessities of the cause in which he was engaged

and of supplying those necessities by his own personal exertions. Not like the mass of educated men, or even of men intrusted with some great public interest—he suffered no moment to pass without considering what might be done when opportunity should offer, and no opportunity of action to escape him when the favorable moment arrived. He was a diligent, thoughtful, earnest, large-minded worker in the beginnings and in the times when all encouragement was only the hope of the future. But just as in the College, so also in the cause of science, if the beginnings are lost to view in what may follow them, they are no less the evidence of faithful service or of large powers.

But we are not left to the views or testimony on this subject of persons like ourselves, outside of the field of natural science. The volumes contain expressions of opinion in regard to his services from some of the most illustrious scientific men now living in the country. Professor Henry, alluding to his first acquaintance with Professor Silliman, on the occasion of a visit to New Haven in 1830, remarks as follows: “He exercised at that time a wide and commanding influence on the science of the country; gave dignity to its pursuit; was the eloquent expounder of its principles, the able advocate of its importance, and its defender against the denunciations of zealous, though narrow-minded theologians, and that, too, with an humble and devout acceptance of the essential truths of revelation.” The same gentleman adds, in regard to the *American Journal*: “Its establishment and maintenance under restricted pecuniary means was an enterprise which involved an amount of thought and of labor, for the expenditure of which he has well merited the gratitude not only of his own countrymen but of the world. It has served not only to awaken a taste for science in this country by keeping its readers continually informed of the discoveries in science, wherever it is cultivated, but, above all, it has called into the field of original observation and research a corps of efficient laborers, and has furnished a ready means of presenting the results of their labors to the world, through a medium well suited to insure attention, and to secure proper acknowledgment for originality and priority. Nor are the results which have been thus evoked few or unimportant, since many of them

relate to the objects and phenomena of a vast continent almost entirely unexplored, in which nature has exhibited some of her operations on a scale of grandeur well calculated to correct the immature deductions from too limited a survey of similar appearances in the Old World." He also states, in connection with the foregoing remarks, that Professor Silliman, "through his public lectures and by means of the *Journal*, became more widely known and more highly appreciated than any other man of science in this country." Professor Jeffries Wyman says, in a letter to the editor of these volumes: "His gifts as a teacher were of such marked excellence, that it is not easy to do justice to them. It may be fairly claimed that no one in this country has done more than he, through his popular lectures no less than his academic courses, to create and foster a love for geology and the physical sciences. The progress due to his beneficent influence cannot easily be estimated. The influence he exerted, the progress he stimulated, were the work of his life—a great boon to science." And Professor Josiah P. Cooke, the present distinguished instructor in Harvard College in the chemical department, referring to Professor Silliman's lectures before the Lowell Institute, in Boston, in 1839–1843, gives him the praise which would be the most welcome of all rewards to a teacher in any branch of learning. "At those lectures," he remarks, "I was an attentive listener. Although a mere boy—one of the youngest of those present—I then acquired my taste for the science which has since become the business of my life." The record given in Mr. Silliman's diary also—a simple narrative, as it is, of the period during which he was lecturing in Boston, New York, and elsewhere—is full of evidence, in the numbers of his immense audiences and the interest which they displayed, as well as in the testimony of prominent men in every walk of life, that he did, in those years, a most remarkable and a most useful work. No one who will review his life can fail to feel that he was, indeed, a remarkable and useful man.

But a man's work, at the best, is only a portion of his life, and there are other portions of it which have more to do with his real self. The two volumes which Professor Fisher has given to the public, and which, as we have seen, are almost

entirely made up of the story told by Mr. Silliman himself, present, when taken together, the characteristics and peculiarities of his nature—his whole inward and outward being—mainly as they were. The attentive reader, who will carefully peruse the whole work from beginning to end, and will weigh the different parts against each other, will gain, we think, very nearly the same impression of the man as those were enabled to gain who were acquainted with him for many years, and observed him in his daily course. In his person he was almost the model of manly beauty. The excellent portrait, at the opening of the first volume, will give to those who never saw him a faithful representation of his face as it appeared in his closing years; and as he was of full stature and commanding presence in every respect, no one could ever meet him without being impressed, or without feeling that nature had given to him, in his physical being, her choicest gifts. The grace and courteousness of his manners were fully equal to the elegance of his person. President Woolsey remarked of him, in his funeral discourse, that he was, among all the men who had lived in New Haven since the beginning of this century, by universal consent the most finished gentleman. We think he must have had peculiar natural endowments, or at least capacities, in this respect. But it cannot fail to be a matter of interest to all who knew him in later life, to observe the anxious thoughtfulness of his mind, from his youth onward, in regard to manners. As early as the close of his junior year in college, we find the wish expressed in his diary, that he may be able to “cultivate the heavenly virtue of affability and complacency to all.” And throughout his earlier career the evidence is everywhere manifest, that he made the cultivation of this virtue one of the important things in life, as a means of success as well as of usefulness. The perfection of ease and grace, which characterized him in old age, was the result of this careful self-training. The influence which it gave him over men of every description, and the aid which it afforded in increasing both his efficiency and his fame may, in all probability, have fully justified to his mind all the care and thought that had been bestowed upon it. The danger, of course, to which the man of manners—the man who devotes

himself to the cultivation of affability as largely as Professor Silliman did, during his whole life, according to the record which he here gives of himself—is that the outward manners will surpass the inward feeling, and that the person who meets such a man, if, indeed, he be a person of penetrating mind, will perceive the art, however perfect it may be. There are men of gracious bearing who say precisely the same gracious things to every one else that they say to ourselves, or precisely the same things to ourselves whenever we meet them; and we sometimes feel, after long acquaintance with them, that they are not so truly gracious and thoughtful of others as they seem to be. But President Woolsey, who knew Professor Silliman longer and better than almost any one else, adds to his remark concerning his gentlemanly character, that it was true of him, in the highest sense,—that it pertained not to his exterior, but to his soul.

This grace of manner was closely connected with the natural kindness of his spirit. Professor Silliman was most truly, in his ordinary dealing with the world, a man of a kind heart. He was thoughtful not only of the interests but of the pleasure of all. He had always a gentle word for children—a sympathizing one for the poor—a helpful one for those who were struggling after an education—an encouraging one for his followers in the way of science. He kept in mind the little things which would make the passing days happier for those around him. He made his house the home for strangers of distinction who visited the city or the college, and was a model of hospitality on the most liberal scale. It should be remarked, also, that his kindness and the constant genial character of his manners were never broken by the anxieties of his own life. He had, in a remarkable degree, the sunny temperament which is so often a blessing to one's friends as to one's self. "The heart at leisure from itself"—free from its own burdens, because always satisfied with the present or hopeful for the future—is the heart which, though not always capable of giving the deepest sympathy to those who are in trouble or sorrow, is able oftentimes to be even a more cheering presence to them, and to point them, even by means of its own peacefulness, beyond the clouds and the darkness. There

are compensations and balancings in this world in all things ; and we believe that the souls of richest experience and deepest thought are not, in general, the ones whose sunshine abides unchanging, or whose daily life shows always the same beautiful serenity. But the serenity and sunshine are beautiful in themselves. They are divinely-given blessings ; and whether they are more to be desired or more to be praised than any others is a matter of but little moment, when, after the ending of the earthly career, we willingly think only of the kindly gifts which God bestowed upon the now finished life. And Mr. Silliman had these in their largest measure. Nor would it have been a thing to be wondered at, that he was thus marked in this regard, even if his natural disposition had been of a somewhat different character. The providential ordering had made his life to be, through its whole course, one of quiet and easy flow. It had given him every advantage of person, of health, of position, of residence, of success, and of fame. It had surrounded him with an affectionate family, into which death did not enter for more than a generation ; and in his old age, had suffered his mantle of office to fall upon two of his own household circle, who, with their children, lived beside him, and were ready to sustain him when life should fail. It had opened to him, at every step, the most pleasant recollections of the past, the most delightful experiences of the present, and the most precious hopes of the future. It had, in one word, granted him a life which for him was as bright and beautiful as was, to all around him, the death by which it was finished. The calm sunlight of a summer day ending in the peaceful beauty of the cloudless evening—how could it be otherwise than it was—the kindliness of a serene spirit shining upon all who came within its presence or its influence.

The friends who knew Professor Silliman intimately in later life will remember, in connection with his kindliness of manner and of heart, how careful he was never to speak evil of any one. He had attained such a position in the world, and was so conscious of it, that he cherished no envy ; and, as for the spirit of detraction, we can imagine nothing that was farther from his soul. But the early diary shows that here also was the

result of careful thought. It is almost amusing to read the repeated admonitions which he gives to himself, during or after his college life, with reference to these faults; for we should as soon have expected to find Abraham Lincoln reproving himself for a tendency toward dishonesty, or Dr. Dwight fearing that he might be deficient in generosity of soul or large-minded views, as to see this venerated friend of ours soberly recording in his journal his liability to express unfavorable opinions of others. But it was the sensitiveness of his mind to these failings, which made him think that he discovered in himself what in reality was not to be seen, just as the noblest souls oftentimes mistake the points, in which they are freest from every fault, for weaknesses against which they ought continually to struggle and to pray. Certainly, if the early years did not differ from the later ones, he was in no danger at any time of falling into this evil. On the contrary, he must have been always an example to all men in his kindly judgment of others, and he seems to have had not even the slightest tendency in his nature to speak of the failings in their character or their actions.

Closely allied to these things, which have been mentioned in respect to his feelings toward other men, was his regard for their favorable opinion of himself. It was not altogether unnatural, and perhaps not altogether unfitting, that one who gave so freely, in this regard, should desire as freely to receive. We leave Professor Fisher, however, to describe his revered friend in his own language. "The love of esteem," he remarks, "was an evident trait of Mr. Silliman. It was manifested from early life. Every reader of these volumes will notice the satisfaction he took in the appreciation accorded to his labors, and in his extending fame. It would be a grave error, however, to conclude that he had a sensibility to admiration, which amounted to a weakness. He had too much self-respect to turn out of his path to seek applause; and the desire of esteem was not the mainspring of his exertions. On the contrary, he was as frank as he was courteous, in avowing his opinions to those who differed from him, and he would instantly risk or sacrifice his popularity rather than desert a principle. While he was thus established in his integrity, he neither felt nor

affected a cynical indifference to the favorable opinion of his fellow-men; and the pleasure, which their approbation and respect gave him, was more apparent in his case, than in that of men who are less apt to expose their feelings."

The true glory and beauty of a man's character, however, are seen in the circle of his own friends and his own household, and the highest praise of Professor Silliman consists in this, that those who were nearest to him speak in terms only of admiration and respect. The Rev. George Jones, who was a connection of his by marriage, as well as a most familiar acquaintance, says, that "during an intimacy extending over thirty-seven years, having seen him in all situations and under all circumstances, domestic and public,—when honored and applauded, or in the midst of trials,"—he believes, "in all this intercourse, he had never known him do a wrong act, or say a wrong word, or, as far as he could judge, think a wrong thought." And he adds:—"Perhaps some would smile at the extent of the eulogy, but those who knew him well will believe that there is no extravagance in the remark." The letters which are given, at the close of the second volume, from his daughters show, also, that he gained the reverence of his own children, and that he was, beyond most men, a loving and affectionate and wise father. As for friends, on the other hand, he had them everywhere—so many that his prayer for them, when he attended the service at the College Chapel, every Saturday evening, has lingered in our remembrance for twenty years,*—while we can scarcely believe that he had a personal enemy in the world. Full of the honors and rewards of a most successful career, he passed through life alike unenvying and unenvied, and passed away from life, at the end, with a universal rejoicing in all that had been or was to be his. He surely had a happy destiny. But no more true is this, than it is that

* The prayer above alluded to is so fine an example of Professor Silliman's command of words and comprehensiveness of expression, as well as so clear an indication of the large number of those who were interested in him, and in whom he was interested, that we cannot forbear to insert it here. It was a petition for "our friends, wherever they are, spread over this our wide land, or perchance in other lands and beyond the seas, whether connected with us by the ties of nature, alliance, consanguinity, affection, gratitude, or grace."

his character must have been a most uncommon one in its qualities and in its harmony, to have fitted him for this destiny with such completeness.

In his moral character, Professor Silliman was marked by his strict adherence to principle. Nothing that was wrong and nothing, even, that violated the highest sense of honor was passed by him without rebuke. It seemed to us sometimes, in our acquaintance with him, that he was so elevated, in this latter respect, as to be almost incapable of judging properly of other men, whose standard was far lower than his own, and who could not, therefore, be trusted, as he well knew, from his own experience, that he could be himself. The deep feeling of the injustice of American Slavery was the natural outgrowth of these sentiments, which lay at the very foundation of his being; and we gladly record on these pages what appeared so clearly in his life and now appears so clearly in the story of it—the steadiness and earnestness of his opposition to this enormous sin through the whole of his long career. No mingling with Southern society—no honors received from Southern men—could ever blind him to the evil of Southern institutions, or save them from the indignant abhorrence of his soul. The country, in every part, became acquainted with his position on this subject and with his manly defense of it, during the great conflict in Kansas; and afterward, during the still greater conflict of which that was the immediate precursor, he was recognized as an earnest, enthusiastic, brave-hearted, prayerful, and ever trustful patriot. Yale College has had a glorious record in all the progress of this long warfare, which has extended over more than forty years, since the great Missouri Compromise first betrayed the cause of freedom to its enemies. It has never failed to declare itself openly for human rights, no matter who might oppose or who might threaten. And when the outrages of more recent times began to astonish the world, it raised its voice, in tones that could not be mistaken, and bore continual witness for the truth even to the triumphant result. The words and principles of the illustrious man, who called Mr. Silliman and his associates to their places in the College—as he declared, that “nothing but the influence of some commanding moral duty would ever induce him to live in a region

where slavery was established"—doubtless sank into the minds of these illustrious pupils, and in their lives was perpetuated the earnest opposition to the wrongs of the system, which he had always felt in his own soul. These honored men fought the good fight in their day. They handed over the work to their successors, unfinished, indeed, but ever growing more hopeful and more full of promise. They laid down their armor, one after another, at the end, believing in God and His cause with a joyful faith. And, to-day, we bless their memory for all that they did in the great work, and for all the inspiration they gave to us who have followed them; while we bless God that we have never lost the inspiration of their example, and that we can now rejoice in the results alike of their prayers and labors and of ours. The peace of to-day—the harmony and prosperity of the future—are the glory of those who contended for the right in every form and every place. And, in no small measure, they are the enduring glory of Yale College. The honored man, whose life we are retracing now, passed away almost as the last one of his own company, and almost at the closing moment of the struggle. But, as we cannot help believing, he passed away to rejoice with those noble spirits who had gone before him to the reward of their faithful service, and to see only the more clearly than is possible to our human vision the great things that God has reserved for the future generations.

In the Christian life, perhaps the most prominent trait in Mr. Silliman's character was his sincere and childlike trust in God. The mysteries of nature and of science, as they opened themselves more and more to his mind, only revealed more and more fully the wonders of the Divine power, and gave their unceasing testimony to the greatness of the Divine love. The still greater mysteries of the plan of salvation, made known in the Bible, assumed to his thought their own higher place, above all that the human intellect was able to attain, while they awakened his perfect confidence in Jesus as the Son of God, and as a Redeemer able to deliver his soul from all the dangers of the future. Life thus became to him a time of fitting himself, in one of the remoter and less perfect parts of the Divine kingdom, for the fullness of a more perfect life that was awaiting him in Heaven. This work of preparation was, indeed,

committed to his own hands, yet it was never lost sight of, for a moment, by the Being who had given it to him to do. As a child, he seems to have always felt that he was in the presence and under the care of an infinite Father; and so he turned for help to this Father, without a doubt or fear rising in his mind, but rather with an unhesitating reliance upon His faithfulness. With a simplicity too, that was no less peculiar than it was charming, he traced every event and every blessing to the providential hand, and was full of thankfulness to God as well for the smallest as the greatest gifts that came to him with the passing days. And at the end, as he had lived through all the long years of his earthly pilgrimage, believing in the nearness of God and the unseen world, he passed, in a moment, into that world with the same restful faith, that he would find there the immediate presence of God with him forever. He was most truly one of those who become as little children, and thus enter into the blessed kingdom.

The review thus presented of the life and character of this distinguished officer of Yale College is an imperfect one, as we are fully aware. There were many things in his work of which we have been unable to speak, and many of our own impressions of him as a man could not be added without extending our Article beyond its proper limits. He was, also, so well known in New Haven, and to multitudes of persons elsewhere, that it has seemed to be almost unnecessary to describe him to our readers; while, if any description at all were needed, we have not been able to forget, that it has already been given by those who were more qualified for the work than ourselves. If we have only succeeded in calling up anew to the minds of any of his friends and admirers a pleasing thought of him as he was, and in leading them to peruse his own story of his own career, we have done all that we proposed to ourselves at the outset. There are two great classes of men in the world—both alike indispensable to its progress and welfare, and both alike worthy of all honor;—those who, in the language of another, are “rather objective than subjective” in their life, and those who are rather the latter than the former. To the former of these two classes Mr. Silliman belonged, and he was one of the most perfect and complete men to be found within it.

He did a great service to mankind, the influence of which will not be lost in the future generations. He filled out his life to the fullness of outward blessings, and all who knew him were thankful, at the end, for the beautiful vision of so long and so happy a career.

Surely it was the Divine ordering. Had he entered on the Law, as he was designing to do, in his earlier years, he might have been a man of success in his profession, perchance, or even have risen to the dignity of office. He might have done a good work in his life, and have been honored and lamented at his death. But who can doubt that his fame would have been less widely extended than it now is, or that his usefulness would have been confined within far narrower limits? Fortunate in that his mature life began just at the moment of "golden opportunity," he was equally fortunate in that a power beyond his own opened to him, at that moment, the academic field, and directed his thoughts and labors into the peaceful ways of science. No less fortunate was the country also, for the thousands of scientific men, who are now rendering such valuable service to the world, seem but as the followers of that light which he kindled, and successors in that priesthood of which he was the founder. The hour smiled kindly, indeed, on Yale College as those two friends—the elder and the younger—met under the beautiful elms, on that summer afternoon, more than sixty years ago, and talked together over the coming time, which they could only believe in and hope for, but could not see. Could the elder of those two friends have had the clear vision of the future, as we now behold it, the joy of his soul would have been a full reward for all his labors. But it was the happy lot of the younger to pass far onward into the then hidden years, and to realize, in his own life and experience, more than either of them had ever imagined. As we stand at the close, as it were, of the career of that generation, and remember what they were, our confidence grows strong within us; for if God so wonderfully watched over and provided for the institution, that He had planted here a century before, as it was entering on a new era of its existence, we cannot fail to believe that He still has glorious purposes for it to accomplish in the world, and that He will watch over it with the same kindly care even to

the remotest future. The names of the dead—the lives of those who have gone before us—seem as the pledge of the Divine favor, and give us the assurance of our brightest hopes.

We cannot close without expressing our appreciation of Professor Fisher's work in preparing these volumes. He has made an excellent use of the large amount of material furnished to him, and deserves the thanks of Mr. Silliman's nearest friends for the careful manner in which he has discharged his duty. Few persons who have not attempted such a work themselves, or have not seen such a mass of correspondence and papers of various kinds, as must be thoroughly examined and arranged in order to the accomplishment of it, can form any adequate idea of what the biographer has to do. The mere stories of men's lives, such as those which were formerly published—descriptions of them by another person, or essays upon their character—were perhaps as much more easily written, as they were less valuable than the modern Memoir. They involved, indeed, more of the biographer's own authorship, but far less of skill and wise judgment. If we are to make a person reveal himself to the world, we must patiently search out all that he has left behind as memorials of his inner as well as his outer life—and though the careless or thoughtless reader may fail to see what the labor has been, the one who is really appreciative will understand that the author has been most truly laborious where he most perfectly hides himself from view. Professor Fisher's effort has been not to give his own estimation of his honored friend, but to present that friend to his readers in the expression of his thoughts and sentiments as they were in all the scenes of his life; and so faithfully has he pictured him, in this way, before our minds, that we read the pages of the biography with almost the same feeling with which we used to see the venerable man himself. Taking the place, as it were, of the editor of an autobiography, he has rendered a service of higher value to those who would know Professor Silliman's whole character, than he could have done if he had drawn but little from the manuscripts which he left. The limits of the volumes, or the private character of the material, have compelled the biographer, as it is, to omit

very much which might, doubtless, have had a peculiar interest, if it could have been published, but enough is given to accomplish the design of the work. The book is essentially, as we have said, an autobiography—the very thing that we should especially have desired in the case of such a man. We cannot doubt that multitudes of the graduates of Yale, and others who knew him in life, will read his simple story of himself with kindly memories and a warm affection.

ARTICLE VI.—PUSEY'S "EIRENICON," WITH THE RE-
PLIES OF MANNING AND NEWMAN.

The Church of England, a Portion of Christ's One Holy Catholic Church, and a Means of Restoring Visible Unity.

AN EIRENICON, in a Letter to the author of "The Christian Year." By E. B. PUSEY, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

The Reunion of Christendom. A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy, &c. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D. D., on his recent EIRENICON. By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D. D., of the Oratory.

The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost; or Reason and Revelation. By HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

DR. PUSEY undertakes in his late "Eirenicon" to construct a platform on which the English Episcopal, the Roman Catholic, and the Greek Churches can unitedly stand. Other Protestant bodies, since they do not adhere to the hierarchical theory of Apostolic succession, he proposes, to borrow a cant phrase, "to leave out in the cold." His catholicism is too narrow to enfold the Lutheran Church, the Church of Scotland, or any other of the non episcopal bodies. The warmest feeling which he has for this vast multitude of professing Christians is that of patronizing compassion. How enslaved to judaizing principles must that mind be, which is compelled to cast beyond the pale of Christian and ecclesiastical fellowship a host of professing Christians, against whom no other charge is brought than that of being destitute of a lineal priesthood! The Methodist Church is rejected, while the Russian Church is caressed and embraced! But how does Dr. Pusey hope to

accomplish the projected union? Why, each party must interpret the creeds and symbols of the other two, so that they shall harmonize with its own standards. The formularies of the Church of England must be so construed as to harmonize with the Tridentine creed, and the creed of Trent so interpreted as not to clash with the Anglican formularies. Dr. Pusey directs his attention chiefly to the relations of the Anglican and Latin Churches. His references to the Greeks seem to be intended in part as a reminder to his Roman Catholic friends that other people exist in the world besides them, and that the Anglican Church, even if rejected at Rome, is not wholly without the hope of obtaining valuable allies. The question naturally arises, how creeds apparently opposed to one another can be brought in unison. Dr. Pusey first affixes a catholicizing sense to the standards of the English Church. He adopts the same perverse construction of the Thirty-nine Articles which was given in the Tract No. XC. by Newman, and in other publications of the Puseyite School. He even lays down the proposition that there is no diversity of opinion between the two Churches upon the Eucharist. The truth is that there were three opinions among the Reformers in regard to the Lord's Supper. The Lutherans and Calvinists agreed in the doctrine that Christ is truly received in the sacrament, and that the Zwinglians were wrong in making the Lord's Supper merely a mnemonic festival. But the Lutherans maintained that the body of Christ is received, in connection with the bread and wine, into the mouth of the recipient, and, accordingly, that believers and unbelievers alike, who partake of the bread and wine, receive the body and blood of the Lord. The Calvinists denied this last dogma, together with the associated doctrine of the ubiquity of the Saviour's glorified body, and held that the reception of Christ in the sacrament is exclusively spiritual and by faith. Now the English Church rejected both the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, and the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation and the ubiquity of Christ's body, and harmonized on this subject with the Calvinistic Protestants on the Continent. Bishop Jewel, under date of February 7, 1562, after the articles had passed, wrote to Peter Martyr, as follows: "As to matters of doctrine, we have pared

everything away to the very quick, and do not differ from your doctrine by a nail's breadth: for as to the ubiquitarian theory, there is no danger in this country. Opinions of that kind can only gain admittance where the stones have sense."* The doctrine of the Church of England is directly opposed to that of the Church of Rome on this subject, which was so prominent a topic of controversy in the period following the Reformation. It would not be difficult to prove that on the great doctrine of justification there is an irreconcilable contradiction between the Anglican articles (the ninth, eleventh, and thirteenth), and the declarations at Trent. The leading propositions in these articles are anathematized in the canons contained in the fourteenth chapter of the Tridentine creed.

The Anglican symbol affirms that justification is forensic, is by faith alone, and that works done before faith partake of the nature of sin. The Tridentine fathers denounce each of these propositions as heretical and damnable. Dr. Pusey finds in the Latin Church two grand obstacles to the union which he yearns to see consummated. One is the extravagant assertion of Papal authority on the part of the ultramontane party, which rises higher and higher in its pretensions; the other is the *cultus* of the Virgin Mary, coupled with the new dogma of the immaculate conception. The power of the Bishop of Rome, he thinks, should be curtailed in conformity with the Gallican theory and the famous principles of Bossuet. The collective body of bishops in council must be acknowledged to be the supreme tribunal in matters of doctrine and discipline. Dr. Pusey points out the growing tendency to enlarge the prerogative of the Pope, as evinced, for example, in the disposition of theologians, like Archbishop Manning, to place his claim to temporal sovereignty among the truths which every loyal Catholic is bound to receive. Very interesting facts are presented in illustration of the deeply-rooted and wide spread worship of the Virgin, and in explanation of the manner in which the new dogma respecting her immaculate character was adopted. The whole book of Dr. Pusey bears witness to his large acquisitions of learning, and is highly

* Zurich Letters, 2d ed., p. 124.

instructive to the theological student, notwithstanding that its reasonings are often fallacious. It is written in a mild and conciliatory, and, we might say, deprecatory tone, with reference to the Roman Catholic Church; yet one might anticipate that its exposure of the inconsistencies in the doctrinal decisions of that Church, as well as its criticism upon the prevalent Mariolatry, would provoke much displeasure. Dr. Pusey takes the singular ground that the doctrinal declarations of the entire Church are inspired and infallible, but that the declarations of either the Anglican, Latin, or Greek Church, by itself, are not possessed of this character. The Church being in a state of temporary, abnormal division, the voice of no part is to be considered the voice of God. Only when all the fragments harmonize in the utterance of a dogma, is it clothed with a divine sanction.

Archbishop Manning's "Pastoral Letter" on "the Renunciation of Christendom," although Dr. Pusey's name is not mentioned in it, is a reply to his work. It is written in a spirited style, and in the dogmatic and somewhat arrogant tone which ecclesiastics of the Roman Church are so apt to assume. He tells Dr. Pusey that he and his followers represent only a fraction of the English Church, and that the English Church contains only a fractional part of the English people; and that the Catholic Church looks with more interest and sympathy upon the great middling class, composed largely of dissenters, than upon the knot of persons who are active in this irenical movement. This statement, considering Dr. Pusey's lofty attitude towards all Protestants outside of the Anglican fold, is quite refreshing. Not less interesting is the charge which Manning brings against the Union movement, when he characterizes it as a form of "indifferentism" in religion. Heterogeneous bodies of Christians are to be amalgamated, all differences of creed being passed by in silence. As Dr. Pusey has made himself so prominent in the character of an opponent of Rationalism, this particular reproach must be quite unwelcome. He, also, proclaims that while the party of Pusey laud Bossuet and Gallicanism, they nevertheless do not accept that minimum of Catholic doctrine to which Bossuet held fast. They do not admit the supreme and infallible authority of the Roman

Catholic Councils, including Trent. Dr. Manning calls upon them to come fairly upon the Gallican platform, or cease to claim fellowship with even the latitudinarian section of the Roman Catholic family. As to the doctrine of Pusey respecting the church, Manning exposes the futility of the theory which gives infallible authority to the church of the first three or four centuries, and finds infallibility nowhere on earth since that time. "The indivisible and exclusive unity of the church is a dogma of faith. The premises of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost were given to a visible and indestructible body. The infallibility of the church flows from the doctrine of the Temporal Mission of the Spirit, which Dr. Manning expounds in another treatise, of which the title is given above. There is a perpetual, living will of the Spirit in the world, and all must heed and obey that will under the penalty of perdition. Dr. Manning's pamphlet is anything but conciliatory. It indicates that no concessions are to be expected from his side. If Dr. Pusey, or anybody else, would be in communion with the Roman Church, and thus save his soul, he must yield humble and unquestioning obedience to all her claims. Such is the tenor of the Archbishop's "Pastoral Letter."

Much more mild and friendly in tone is the letter to Pusey by his old associate, Dr. Newman. It is plain that the latter has no sympathy with the polemical severity of Dr. Manning. Newman's letter abounds in expressions of respect, confidence, and affection. In previous writings he had frankly avowed that the worship of Mary, in the form and extent in which it is practised in the Catholic countries of Southern Europe, had never commended itself to his religious feelings. Partly on account of such avowals, he thinks himself called upon to vindicate the Catholic dogmas respecting Mary, in reply to the adverse criticisms of his friend. The main part of his pamphlet is devoted to a review of the "development" of this branch of Catholic doctrine, from the early conception in the church, according to which she is the second Eve. That which Protestants consider a gradual corruption of religious doctrine, Newman regards as a progressive unfolding of the same, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

The entire controversy which we have sketched above is, in

many respects, quite instructive. It shows that the Roman Church has no disposition to abate a jot of its lofty pretensions. It proves that the Puseyite has no hope of effecting a compromise with the Church towards which he is ever directing a longing eye. It proves that there is no *via media* between an out-spoken Protestantism, and a humble, entire submission to the Roman See.

ARTICLE VI.—RENAN'S NEW WORK ON THE
APOSTLES.

Les Apôtres, par ERNEST RENAN, Membre de l'Institut.
Paris: Michel Levy Frères. 1866.

M. RENAN, in the introductory chapter of his new book, has much to say of his relation to "the theologians." He begs it to be understood that he stands, with reference to them, on the higher plane of a dispassionate critic and historian. On a serene height, removed from the gusts of prejudice and party-feeling, he looks back upon the past and sees things as they are. We cannot perceive that his self-complacency in this particular rests upon any good foundation. He complains that "the theologians" write with a polemical aim. This is not uniformly or necessarily the case; nor is polemical writing of necessity unfair or superficial. But M. Renan is himself, throughout his work, in a more covert way, a polemic. He makes an attack upon the faith of Christendom, by maintaining that historical facts of momentous importance, forming a part of that faith, did not take place as they are commonly believed to have taken place. Nor can he boast of approaching the investigation with a mind clear of prior beliefs and disbeliefs. He has his creed, even if it largely consist of negative articles. He is not less completely swayed by his anterior conception of God and of nature, and of what is possible and probable, than is the most devout theist. A comparison of the intellectual and moral qualifications of M. Renan as a writer on the early history of Christianity, with those of such a theologian as Neander, would show the emptiness of M. Renan's quiet assumption of superiority. In depth of learning, in historical insight, in the spirit of impartiality, and in most of the other endowments of a sound critic, the French philologist stands far behind the German theologian. It is scarcely magnanimous in the former to decry in advance that class which is likely to subject his speculations to a searching criticism. In these in-

quiries, denunciation and appeals to prejudice on either side are impertinent.

The introductory chapter of Renan's new work specially deserves attention, since in it are set forth the speculative assumptions, as well as the critical opinions, which govern his judgments in the chapters which follow. It is difficult to gather from this author's writings, definite, intelligible statements of religious opinion. He disclaims Deism, yet denies that he is either a Pantheist or an Atheist. In reality, the only tangible avowals, in the midst of much cloudy discoursing upon religion, are in the vein of a sentimental Pantheism. "The historical sciences," he says in one place, "presuppose that no supernatural agent disturbs the course of humanity; that there is no being superior to man to whom one can attribute an appreciable part in the moral conduct, more than in the material conduct, of the universe. For myself, I think that there is not in the universe an intelligence superior to that of man; that the absolute of justice and of reason manifests itself only in humanity. *Viewed outside of humanity, this absolute is only an abstraction.* The infinite exists only when it puts on a form." * The fact of the creation of man is, of course, excluded, and is explicitly denied. Man is a development out of inferior existence. Renan affirms that his denial of miracles is not the consequence of a metaphysical system, but is based on observation. Illusion or imposture, he declares, account for all alleged miracles. It is plain, however, that his summary and sweeping disbelief in everything miraculous is the fruit of his Atheistic or Pantheistic premises, of his denial of a moral administration of the world. What room for miracles under such a system? What is left but to deny their possibility, as Renan does in other parts of his writings? He requires, as a condition precedent to faith, that a miracle be performed in Paris before competent *savans*! His demand for an experiment is like the proposal once made to Jesus, that he should cast himself from the pinnacle of the temple. Christianity, Renan affirms, is no more an impossible product of unaided human powers than Greek Art. The latter, in fact, is the

* Quoted in Pressensé's *Jesus Christ, sa Vie, etc.*, p. 12.

more surprising phenomenon, because it is farther from having a rival in the same line. But of Christianity as a method of deliverance for man from the darkness and bondage of sin, he has no appreciation. This essential peculiarity of the religion of Christ, it is hardly an exaggeration to say that he passes over in silence. The bearing of the Gospel upon the moral nature, and the relations of the Gospel to the profoundest necessities of the soul, to the sense of guilt, and the yearning for freedom from the sway of vicious inclination, are almost entirely ignored. In this particular, the writings of Renan are more shallow than those of any other Rationalistic author of distinction with whom we are acquainted. In giving an account of the historical preparation for Christianity, and of the successful propagation of the Gospel in the Roman Empire, he leaves out this fact of capital importance. Starting with a speculative scheme which, in our judgment, is false and superficial, and assuming that all testimony to miracles is at once to be rejected—a strange ground for a philosopher to take who professes to base everything on observation—he can do no less than attempt to resolve the events recorded in the New Testament into hallucination or fraud. His critical procedure is highly instructive. He admits that we have frequently the testimony of eye-witnesses. He allows that in many cases phenomena took place which impressed the participants and witnesses as supernatural. He is, moreover, often perplexed and generally unsuccessful in devising a plausible naturalistic explanation of the admitted facts. He follows the Christian believer with his concessions up to the point of allowing the miracle. Then he diverges, and the ground of his divergence is obviously not the lack of evidence in itself considered, but his notion that a miracle is essentially and under all circumstances incredible. The real conflict, then, is about the truths of natural religion. If there is no Creator and Moral Governor of the world, no sinful separation of man from Him, no need of Reconciliation, no need of an attested Revelation, Renan is quite right, and might have spared himself the trouble of a formal attempt to destroy the belief in miracles.

On the other hand, if his position on these prior fundamental questions is false, his attitude with regard to revealed

religion is equally unphilosophical. This writer often speaks of the early disciples as victims of an illusion or hallucination. It must not be forgotten that the Bible uses similar language respecting those who say that there is no God except an abstraction. Renan, in order to be consistent, must treat prayer as he treats every other recognition of the Supernatural, and call that, too, a "douce illusion." To characterize his book as a *History of the Apostles from the stand-point of Atheism* is not to use the language of opprobrium but of simple truth.

The critical reader will look with equal curiosity into Renan's introductory chapter, to ascertain his estimate of the principal document on which a modern historian of the Apostles must depend—the book of Acts. As in his "Life of Jesus," so here he holds to the correct opinion, in opposition to Baur, that the author of the Acts was Luke, and that Luke was an attendant of Paul in some of his missionary journeys. This book he justly pronounces a continuation of the third Gospel. "The third Gospel and the Acts form one work very well constructed, composed with reflection, and even with art, written by the same hand and according to a consecutive plan."* Hence the supposition that the book comes from a later writer, by whom the passages in which "we" occurs are cited, is with good reason rejected. Renan thinks that the third Gospel was written very soon after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus, and as the sequel is of a later date, he places it about the year 80. This, however, is a conjectural date, and, in our judgment, the work was composed several years earlier, and shortly after the date assigned to the Gospel. As to the credibility of Luke, there are two points in Renan's remarks which require attention. He considers the first twelve chapters to be of inferior authority to the last sixteen, in which Paul's missions are described, and to be, in short, in many things untrustworthy; and he takes up the Tübingen doctrine that Luke accommodated his narrative throughout to a theological purpose—that of reconciling parties in the Church. As regards the first point of the impeachment of Luke, it must be observed that Renan goes

* p. xi.

further than to impute occasional inaccuracies to the historian in the earlier part of the Acts; he attributes to these chapters a somewhat low degree of historical value. This opinion is closely connected with the borrowed Tübingen theory respecting the design and structure of the entire book, and his arguments in favor of both propositions are mingled together. It is strange that Renan should take this last theory under his patronage. As he follows the narrative of Luke in detail, he seldom, if ever, postulates pure invention on the part of the historian, but adheres to his own favorite notion of a legend, an illusion or hallucination. Baur made the Acts a product of the second century, and denied it to be a veritable composition of Luke. A theological fiction could, with more plausibility, be supposed to have been written after so long an interval from the death of the Apostles Peter and Paul. But among various insuperable difficulties in the way of Baur's theory, the omission of the author of the Acts to make use of the Pauline Epistles, where material subservient to his alleged design would naturally first have been sought, is decisive. Renan lays hold of a part of the Tübingen hypothesis—a part which cannot stand by itself. He couples the imputation of a theological tendency, leading to much invention as well as distortion, with an admission of the genuineness and early date of the book. He would have us believe that Luke—a trusted companion of Paul, a contemporary of the other Apostles, an earnest believer in the Gospel—made up stories concerning Peter and Paul for the sake of pacifying contention among their respective disciples; and that, only ten years after the death of these Apostles, in the midst of a multitude who had known both, these radical misrepresentations were accepted without a question! Baur himself was too discerning and too consistent to give his assent to so improbable a view. In proof of his charge against Luke, Renan states that, contrary to Paul's own assertion (in Gal. i. 11., seq.), Luke represents that the Apostle went up to Jerusalem immediately after his conversion, and lived on a footing of cordial intimacy with the other Apostles, preaching to the Hellenist Jews. The design of Luke, according to Renan, in this false representation, was to exhibit Paul in relations of friendship and equality with the rest of the Apostles. First,

let us inquire into the pretended discrepancy in regard to the date of this visit of Paul to Jerusalem. Luke says (Acts ix. 23) that it was "after that *many days* were fulfilled." Paul himself states that it was "after three years" (Gal. i. 18). It is said that the expression "many days" cannot be taken to cover so long a period. But Paley furnishes us an example from the Old Testament, showing that the phrase may cover just this interval. In I Kings ii., 38, 39, we read:—"And Shimei dwelt in Jerusalem *many days*. And it came to pass *at the end of three years*, that two of the servants of Shimei ran away," etc. As to the length of Paul's stay, on this occasion, at Jerusalem, he states himself that he abode with Peter fifteen days, meeting also James, the Lord's brother (Gal. i. 18, 19). If the language of Luke in ch. ix. is such, in itself considered, as to lead us to suppose that he would make the visit of Paul of longer duration, an opposite impression is made by his second reference to this same visit (Acts xxii. 17, 18), where Paul is reported as saying: "it came to pass that when I was come again to Jerusalem, even while I prayed in the temple, I was in a trance, and saw Him saying unto me, 'Make haste and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem; for they will not receive thy testimony concerning me.'" Paul confirms Luke in several of the statements in Acts ix., for he says (Gal. i. 21—23): "Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and Cilicia,"—Luke states (Acts ix. 30) that he went to Tarsus by the way of Caesarea—and was unknown by face unto the churches of Judea, which were in Christ; but they had heard only that "he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the faith which once he destroyed." The churches had no acquaintance with him; they had merely heard a report of his conversion. Whatever difficulty may be found with the statements of Luke in Acts ix. 26—30, whatever opinion may be held in regard to his correctness in minor particulars, there is nothing in the passage to lend the slightest support to Renan's accusation. No position, with reference to Peter and the other Apostles, is attributed to Paul, different from that which his own words imply, when he says (Gal. i. 18) that he abode with Peter fifteen days. Renan (following Baur) further charges that Paul (Gal. i. and ii.) expressly excludes every journey to Jerusalem between Acts ix. 26 and

Acts xv. 2; that Luke, therefore, moved by the same desire to connect Paul with the other Apostles, interpolates a journey (Acts xi. 30, xii. 25), which was never made. Luke having stated (Acts xi. 27—29) that prophets who had come to Antioch from Jerusalem had predicted a famine, and that the Antioch disciples determined to send relief to their brethren, adds (ver. 30) that they actually “sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul.” The next chapter of Acts is mostly filled with a narrative of the imprisonment and miraculous release of Peter, which led to his departure to Caesarea, and with an account of the death of Herod. At the close of the chapter (ver. 25), stands the brief remark:—“And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them John, whose surname was Mark.” Thus, all that is said of the messengers is that they went to Jerusalem and returned. Now Baur and Renan do not impute to Luke in this place an inaccuracy, in following, for example, a tradition which mistakenly joined Paul and Barnabas in this affair; but they charge the historian with intentional falsifying. We must then believe that the story of the famine and of Agabus, the occasion of the mission, was likewise invented, and that having taken such pains to bring Paul to Jerusalem and to the Apostles there, Luke is so stupid as to interpose the statement that Peter had gone to Caesarea, so that, of course, Paul could not meet him, and to confine himself to the bare remark that the messengers went and returned! But what of the alleged contradiction with Paul? The latter does *not* say that his journey to Jerusalem, seventeen years after his conversion, on the occasion of the Apostolic Convention, was the journey next following the first after his conversion, there being no intermediate visit. His language is:—“Then (πάλιν), fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem.” If the journey recorded in Acts xi. 30, xii. 25, was a hasty one, affording no opportunity of conference upon matters of doctrine with the other Apostles—Peter was certainly absent—Paul may not have thought himself called upon to notice it in this passage of the Epistle to the Galatians. Something may have prevented him at that time from entering the city. Some little circumstance unknown to us might instantly remove all appearance of discrep-

ancy. Neander and Meyer are inclined to think, from Gal. i. ii., that there is an inaccuracy in Luke's representation of the part taken by Paul in bearing the Antioch gifts to Jerusalem. But if this be assumed, still no color of support is given to the accusation of Baur and Renan. This accusation is, in our judgment, partly for the reasons already given, simply preposterous. If Luke had wished to go beyond the truth in giving Paul a good standing with the Jerusalem Apostles, he would have laid hold of whatever facts he could gather which promised to be of service to his plan. Paul's stay with Peter for a fortnight (Gal. i. 18) would have been made prominent, and would have been garnished with abundant detail. That no mention is made of it by Luke is an unanswerable refutation of Baur's hypothesis, which includes the ascription of a late date to Acts. The writer of Acts, it is certain, had no help from the Epistle to the Galatians, or from any of the rest of Paul's writings. But it is also conclusive against that weakened form of the Tübingen hypothesis, which is adopted by Renan. For if Luke—"un avocat habile," he is called by Renan,*—had cherished the purpose which the latter imputes to him, he certainly would not have neglected to make inquiry for facts that would aid him in giving effect to his design. He would not have resorted to such efforts of contrivance as are imputed to him, when he could as readily build upon acknowledged truth. The next proof of inaccuracy, and of a theological bias on the side of Luke, is the supposed contradiction between his narrative of the Apostolic Convention (Acts xv.) and Gal. ii. 1—11. The chief ground of the charge in this instance against Luke is his omission to mention the *private* interview which is described by Paul, together with his record of a public proceeding which Paul omits. That Luke should make no mention of the private conference is no matter of surprise. That Paul omits a notice of the public meeting is accounted for when the aim and scope of this passage of the Epistle to the Galatians are considered. He is here intent upon showing his personal relations to the other Apostles. This is the one absorbing topic; and in his rapid review, extending over the whole interval subsequent to

* P. xxxix.

his conversion, he leaves out everything that is not essential to his aim. Paul had no call to bring before the Galatians the recommendation of that public conference. It had reference solely to the churches of Syria and Cilicia, and to a particular disturbance which had been excited among them by Judaizers from the metropolis. He certainly did not feel bound to apply that recommendation in the far wider circle of missionary effort on which he afterwards entered, and among churches composed chiefly of heathen converts. There is nothing in the circumstances of the public conference, nothing in the parts attributed to the different characters, which is either in contradiction to known facts, or at all improbable. Paul is himself our witness to prove that Peter, James, and John were satisfied with his teachings, and gave him the hand of fellowship (Gal. ii 6, 9). Renan is mistaken in his opinion that the course taken by Peter at Antioch (Gal. i. 11 seq.), which drew upon him the rebuke of Paul, was in opposition to the so-called decree of the Convention. That decree did not require of the Jewish Christians that they should eat with the Gentiles. This particular question was not touched at the Conference. But on this point we have spoken fully in another place. Luke is charged with inventing facts to cover up a division that had existed in the Church; but the testimony of Paul, while it does not clash with the record of Luke, brings out with even greater emphasis the recognition and pledge of fellowship which he received from the Jerusalem Apostles. In spirit the two narratives are consonant. There were active Judaizers, but they could not divide the Church, or move the leading Apostles to impose circumcision upon the Gentiles.

Renan, following Baur, claims that the miracles ascribed to Peter by Luke, and those which he ascribes to Paul, form two series corresponding to each other. For example, Peter heals a lame man at the gate of the temple at Jerusalem; Paul likewise cures a cripple at Lystra. But the diseased were wont to place themselves at the gates of temples and cities; and such a coincidence in the case of the two Apostles is so far from giving cause for suspicion, that we should rather wonder if it did not occur. The other instances of resemblance between the miracles done by Peter and Paul are equally

natural and almost unavoidable. Paul affirms that he had shown the signs of an Apostle; that he had worked miracles. That they should consist in healing the sick and in raising the dead, like the miracles of the other Apostles and of Jesus, is surely nothing unexpected. The attempt to convict Luke of mendacity breaks down for the lack of evidence in support of it. The indictment is framed with most ingenuity by the Tübingen critics, and Renan mars their hypothesis in borrowing it. But the Tübingen hypothesis, besides the invalidity of the positive proofs adduced in defense of it, is refuted by the existence of numerous passages in the book of Acts which a writer, having the design that is attributed to Luke, would never have admitted.

After the Introduction, Renan proceeds in the first two chapters of his work to describe the origin of the disciples' faith in the Resurrection of Jesus. He takes it for granted, as might be expected, that the event did not occur and that the belief in its reality was a delusion. But how shall we explain a delusive belief, so new and startling, so fixed and universal, among the followers of the crucified Master? Renan differs from Strauss in adhering more closely to the New Testament narratives of the appearances of Jesus subsequent to his burial, especially to the record in John's Gospel and that given by Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 1. seq. He begins by admitting that the disciples gave themselves up at first to despondency. But the "enthusiasm of love" knows of no situation from which an egress is impossible. Words of Christ relative to his second advent might be recalled and taken in a wrong sense, as if they referred to his coming forth from the tomb. Enoch and Elijah had not tasted death. It could not be possible that He was subject to death. Heroes never die. They could not consent that the adored Master should be left to perish in the tomb. The day following the crucifixion was filled with such thoughts as these. Did He not say that he would give salvation to the sinner, that He would live again in the Kingdom of His Father? Yes! He will live once more! He will roll away the rock from the tomb! He will rise to the Father! We shall see him and hear his voice. At this point in his animated picture, Renan pauses to say that the Jews hardly conceived

of the soul as separable from the body, that this theory of man regarded as composed of two substances was scarcely clear to them. But the Evangelist records of Jesus that He said: "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit," and that having said thus, "*He gave up the ghost.*" The passages in the Gospels in which the soul is distinguished from the body are too numerous to allow us to admit the truth of Renan's observation respecting the current opinion. The disciples could have no difficulty in supposing that a soul was in heaven while the body to which it had belonged lay in the tomb. Early on Sunday morning, says Renan, Mary Magdalene repaired to the sepulchre, but found it empty. The body was no longer there. Her first emotions were those of surprise and grief. Possibly a gleam of hope entered her heart. She runs and makes her report to Peter and John. They hasten to the tomb and find the linen clothes and the napkin lying apart by itself. If they did not utter the decisive words, "He is risen," it is easy to see that this consequence must be drawn and that the foundation is laid for the great dogma of Christianity. Peter and John retire from the garden; Mary remains alone. She longs to embrace the loved body in her arms. On a sudden she hears a slight movement behind her. She believes that it is the gardener and exclaims: "If thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him and I will take him away." She hears herself addressed in return by her name, uttered in the familiar voice of Jesus. "O my Master," she cries. She desires to touch him. A sort of instinctive movement carries her to his feet. The vision withdraws itself, and *says to her*, "*touch me not!*" "Gradually the shade disappeared. But the miracle of love is accomplished." "Mary has seen and heard. The Resurrection has its first direct witness." All this Renan, of course, considers to have been the product of Mary's excited imagination and glowing love. The subsequent interviews of Jesus with other individuals among the disciples and with the assembly of them on repeated occasions when they fancied that they heard him speak to them—His renewed intercourse with them in Galilee, His appearance to an assembly of five hundred, His commandment, which they thought they heard him utter, to preach the Gospel to all nations—were all the fruit of

a like hallucination. We should remark that what is said by Christ in these interviews, Renan in almost all cases takes pains to abridge. He feels the necessity of making the utterances which the disciples, one and all, supposed themselves to hear from the lips of their Master, as brief as he can. One problem remains. What became of the body of Jesus? This question Renan pronounces insoluble. The Jews thought the disciples had carried it away by stealth. This explanation fails to fully satisfy our author: One can hardly admit, he remarks, that the same persons, however undisciplined in reflection, who had carried the body away, believed that it had been raised to life. This little quantity of common sense is conceded to the Apostles. What became of the body? It is possible, answers Renan, that the body was removed by some of the disciples and carried away to Galilee. The others who remained at Jerusalem had no knowledge of this event. When the former afterwards heard the reports concerning the Resurrection, which had originated at Jerusalem they would not have interposed a contradiction, and if they had, there would have been no use in doing so. A late correction in such a case has no effect. This solution of the difficulty is gravely brought forward by Renan, but it scarcely requires a grave answer. That the body was removed without the privity of the Apostles; that, this being done, no information of the fact was conveyed to them; that the place where it was finally deposited was not remembered or made known; that the active agents in the removal of the body would never care to testify to the truth, or that, doing so, their statements would have no hearing,—such are some of the requirements of this extraordinary hypothesis. Perhaps, Renan also suggests, the body was taken away by the Jews to prevent further tumults. Strange, if this were so, that the Resurrection was not instantly disproved! Strange, too, that the Jews should charge the disciples with stealing it! “Who knows that the disappearance of the body was not the act of the proprietor of the garden in which the tomb lay, or of the gardener?” Here there is an objection in the statement of the Evangelist that the tomb belonged to Joseph of Arimathea. This inconvenient assertion, which, however, relates to a point that must

have fixed itself in the recollection of the disciples, Renan finds it easy to call in question. But the careful disposition of the linen clothes and the napkin is, in this Author's own view, a grave difficulty. This last circumstance would lead to the supposition that the hand of a woman had been employed upon them. Renan forthwith turns to Mary Magdalene as the one who is probably responsible for the removal of the sacred body. Women, he observes, being ruled by passion, are capable of the most grotesque illusions. It is not deliberate deception, he says; it is deception without reflection. We must bring into the account the exaltation of feeling and of faith, and also the defect in Oriental education as regards sincerity. So that poor Mary Magdalene, who a few pages before is lauded as the subject of the first "hallucination," as the disciple who supposed that the risen Jesus called her by name, is now made to bear the whole burden of that stupendous imposture which the Jews charged upon the surviving followers of Jesus! It is only just to add that here, as before, M. Renan doubts his own solution.

The reader will see that Renan generally admits the phenomena in which Christians find evident proofs of supernatural interposition; he maintains that these phenomena are subjective in their origin. With his view of the person, character, and mission of Jesus, and with his scheme of philosophy, in which a personal God has no place, such a conclusion is inevitable. But both of his works on the origin of Christianity incidentally afford an impressive view of the strength of that testimony of the Apostles on which the Christian believer reposes. That the Apostles testified to the miracles which the Gospels record, including the miracle of the Resurrection of the Lord, the skeptic who will credit no miracle that has not been repeated in Paris, allows. What shall be done with this testimony? One hypothesis is, or was, that the witnesses were knaves. Another hypothesis is that they were fools. The hypothesis of M. Renan is that, they were fools with a mixture of a sort of knavery, which by his standard of morals is judged innocent and even amiable.

The third and fourth chapters of M. Renan's book are devoted to the Return of the Apostles to Jerusalem and the De-

scent of the Holy Spirit. "Meanwhile," he says, "the apparitions, as happens in the movements of enthusiastic credulity, began to abate. Popular imaginations resemble contagious diseases; they quickly effervesce and change their form."* "The activity of the ardent souls had already turned in another direction. What they believed they had heard from the mouth of the dear Risen One, was the command to go forward, to preach, to convert the world. Where commence? Naturally with Jerusalem."† "The apparitions became more and more infrequent. They spoke of them much less, and they began to think that they should no more see the Master until His solemn coming in the clouds. Their imaginations reverted with increased force to a promise which they supposed Jesus to have given." This was the promise of the Holy Spirit. "When the visions became more rare, they fell back upon this Spirit, conceived of as a Consoler, as another self whom Jesus would send to his friends."‡ "The whole activity of imagination which the sect had exhibited in creating the legend of the Resurrection, it now applied to the creation of a group of pious beliefs upon the descent of the Spirit and His marvelous gifts."§ "Hallucinations of touch being very common among persons so nervous and in so exalted a state of feeling, the least current of air, accompanied by a trembling in the midst of silence, was considered as the passage of the Spirit."¶ The gifts of the Spirit, as the gift of tongues, are resolved into the effects, partly imaginary and partly real, of the ecstasy of excitement into which the disciples were thrown. According to Renan, the disciples were a band of weak-minded, almost imbecile, visionaries, whose appropriate home would be a mad-house. Yet they were the men whom Jesus chose for his daily companions and the representatives of his cause, whom he had trained for nearly three years, who were capable of relishing his lofty teachings, who were able to deny themselves and to lay down life for the cause of truth and righteousness. Had the founders of Christianity been the set of enthusiastic, silly children whom Renan describes, the movement would have perished at its very inception. It could not

* p. 45.

† p. 45.

‡ pp. 51, 52.

§ p. 31.

¶ p. 61.

have survived the shock of disappointed hopes, or borne the brunt of contradiction and persecution. The fact is that the Apostles were convinced, in their inmost souls, of the divine mission of Jesus; and the incredulity, which his humble life and judicial death engendered, was overcome by evidences of supernatural power, the reality of which even the skeptical Thomas found it impossible to deny. If Renan had done any justice to the moral and religious elements which entered into the faith and the preaching of the Apostles, and to their moral earnestness, the picture of them which he presents would have assumed a totally different aspect. As if the superstitious dreams of a few ignorant, bewildered people, bereft of a friend on whom they have doted, and unable to reconcile themselves to his loss, could have kept Christianity alive and sent it on its conquering, purifying mission around the globe!

Renan has found a physiological explanation of the conversion of Paul. After a sketch of his early career, he proceeds to describe Paul's eventful journey to Damascus. His mental excitement on this occasion, says Renan, was at its height. At times he was troubled, shaken in his purpose. "A passionate man goes from one belief to another directly opposite; only he brings to the latter the same heat. Like all strong souls, Paul was near to loving that which he hated. Was he sure, after all, that he was not withstanding the work of God?" Perhaps the liberal ideas of his master Gamaliel came to his recollection. Often these ardent souls experience terrible reactions. He had been struck with the demeanor of those whom he had persecuted. At times he thought he saw the sweet figure of the Master who inspired his disciples with so much patience, regarding him with an air of pity and tender rebuke. In this agitated mood, he pursues his journey towards Damascus. At length he comes in sight of the city and perceives what are, perhaps, the houses of his victims. This thought seizes on him and clogs his steps. He would fain proceed no farther. He imagines that he is withstanding a goad that urges him to an opposite course. The fatigue of the journey, joined to this feeling, overcomes him. Renan adds that Paul had an inflammation of the eyes, perhaps incipient ophthalmia. Persons in this region, we are told, are liable to be

seized with fevers accompanied by delirium. All that we can be sure of, in this case, is that a terrible stroke bereft Paul, in a single instant, of what consciousness remained to him, and cast him upon the earth, deprived of sense. What precisely this sudden stroke was, M. Renan professes himself unable with certainty to decide. There may have been a tempest and the lightning may have struck him; a fever and delirium may have been suddenly induced by a sun-stroke or by ophthalmia. But these cerebral disturbances sometimes produce a retroactive effect, we are assured, and completely derange the recollection of the moments that preceded the crisis. In the midst of the illusions to which all his senses were a prey, Paul fancied that he saw the figure which had seemed to be pursuing him for several days. He saw Jesus and heard him say in Hebrew:—"Saul! Saul! why persecutest thou me?" Ardent natures pass in a moment from one extreme to another. Paul was converted in an instant; but, says Renan, "he had only changed his fanaticism." He was the same fiery zealot that he was before. Made blind by the occurrence, he was conducted by his companions to Damascus. For three days he took no food. He had often heard of the healing power possessed by the Christians. The idea that the imposition of hands could relieve him took possession of his mind. "His eyes were always very much inflamed." Among the images that chased one another across his brain was that of Ananias—a leading disciple of whom he had heard the persons about him speak—in the act of entering and laying his hands upon him. Now he is fully convinced that he will owe his cure to Ananias. Ananias is sent for; he comes, speaks gently to the invalid, calls him "brother," and places his hands upon him. From this moment, calm entered the soul of Paul. "He believed himself cured, and since his malady was chiefly nervous, it was true."

Such is Renan's description of the conversion of the Apostle Paul. The leading elements of his theory are borrowed from Baur and Strauss. The first remark we have to offer upon this theory is, that, as far as we know, the Apostle Paul was subject to no bodily infirmity that tended to produce the phenomena attending his conversion. It has been plausibly conjectured that his eyes were affected with some disease; but

there is no evidence that he suffered in this way until a period later than his conversion, and no proof whatever that his disease was that known by the name of ophthalmia. Of whatever nature the infirmity was, there is not the slightest evidence that it was connected with a disorder of the brain or with a tendency to such a disorder. Paul was remarkable for his presence of mind, for his unruffled self-possession under alarming circumstances. This natural quality he discovered even when he was struck to the earth, in the response which he made to the supernatural voice,—“Who art thou, Lord?” The *physical* predisposition to mental illusions of the sort supposed by Renan is attributed to Paul without any warrant. Secondly. Renan ascribes to the Apostle, just before his conversion, a state of feeling which he is known not to have had. He represents that Paul was full of painful misgivings as to the righteousness of the course he was pursuing. But Paul declares that he had no such misgivings. He verily thought that he was doing God service. No inquisitor was ever more persuaded that he was doing a good work in extirpating heresy, than was Saul up to the moment when he was stopped, on the way to Damascus. Renan appears to misunderstand the sense of the words,—“It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.” They no more have reference to any inward misgivings or inward struggle in Paul’s mind, than they have to the precession of the equinoxes. The entire picture of Paul’s conflict of feeling, which Renan presents, is a figment of his own imagination. The *psychological*, like the physiological, hypothesis respecting Paul, is groundless. That men of an ardent nature are liable to rapid fluctuations and sudden revolutions of sentiment, is a remark that needs much qualification. It is not true where an energetic will is associated with a strong emotive nature. Men of this stamp, on the contrary, are the very ones to press through all difficulties and pursue the goal which they have set before them with an unfaltering purpose. This is eminently true when to this ardor of feeling and energy of will there is united a strong understanding. To such men hesitation and vacillation, self-questioning and the habit of looking back,—much more, sudden revulsions of feeling, leading to a total reversal of a chosen course,—are unusual. If Paul

was the man whom M. Renan figures, analogous revolutions of opinion might be looked for after his conversion. But for thirty years, up to the time of his death, he "fought the good fight" and "kept the faith." Thirdly, Paul's change of character, the moral and spiritual change, not only receives from Renan no solution, but is scarcely recognized. This illustrates the inferiority of Renan's method of handling these subjects when compared with that of the leading German advocates of Naturalism. The reader would infer from Renan's observations that Paul had the same tempers of feeling after as before his conversion. Is it true, then, that he continued to "breathe out threatenings and slaughter" against all errorists? Would he still have been inclined, had he possessed the power, to drag men and women from their homes and cast them into dungeons? That Paul had noble traits before he believed in Christ, and that these remained with him afterwards, is acknowledged. It is equally true, however, that his moral tempers underwent a transformation as radical as it was beneficent in its operation. A writer who undertakes to treat of the conversion of Paul ought not to lose sight of this momentous change. There are many other features of M. Renan's fancy-picture, that invite criticism. The mode in which he imagines Paul to have come in contact with Ananias and to have been cured by him of his blindness, will hardly satisfy the candid reader. How a thunder-clap, or a sun-stroke, or a sudden fever, which, we are assured by M. Renan, may be so easily supposed in those latitudes, should be so unintelligible to the companions of Paul, as well as to Paul himself, is a circumstance not explained. But the fundamental error of Renan is the naturalistic prejudice with which he starts, coupled with the singular failure to appreciate or even to notice distinctively, the moral elements in the Christian system and in the experience of its believers. One would suppose, in reading this work, that the proper place for a history of Christianity is in a treatise on the morbid affections of body and mind.

Renan presents a somewhat exaggerated view of the so-called Communism of the early Church at Jerusalem. The voluntary sacrifice of property on the part of the converts is a striking proof of the sense of brotherhood that prevailed

among them. It is a powerful testimony to the fact that a new community had come into being. But Renan fails to bring out, or, at least, to give due prominence to several important circumstances. The surrender of property was in no sense compulsory (Acts v, 4). It was a spontaneous love-offering on the part of believers. They gave or withheld their possessions, and if they took the latter course, they were without blame. And this surrender of property into the common stock, even if it was general at the outset, did not continue. We find that Mary (Acts xii, 12) dwelt in her own house. There was nothing like a division or equal distribution of property, according to a communistic theory. But in consideration of the great number of poor Christians who needed aid, and in the glow of their first espousal of the Gospel, the disciples generally gave in their property for charitable uses. Their action was no law to the Church, but the spirit that dictated the movement deserves to be copied.

Renan devotes considerable space to a portrayal of the condition of the world in the first century of our era, with special reference to the prospects of Christianity at that time. He thinks it no marvel that the new religion made so rapid progress and achieved so complete a triumph. It is true that there was a moral and spiritual, as well as a political, preparation for the Gospel, in ancient society. The success of Christianity was not wrought by magic. The absorption of so many peoples into one empire, tended to break down the barriers of prejudice that had parted nation from nation. There was a dawning sense of a kinship embracing mankind. The politics of Julius Cæsar helped to bring in a more cosmopolitan spirit in the room of Roman exclusiveness. Along with the influence of philosophy in undermining the popular faith in the mythological religions, was joined the impression produced by the evident failure of local deities to protect the tribes and kingdoms which had trusted in them. But philosophy failed to fill the void which the progress of intelligence had created. Philosophy could not satisfy the aspirations which it helped to kindle. The bond that could draw men into one community, fuse them in a brotherhood, was wanting. Hence the preparation for the Christian religion in the ancient world was, to a large extent,

negative. There was, indeed, a more or less vivid consciousness of a want, but the existing systems afforded no means of supplying it. The Gospel in its doctrine of the Kingdom of God and its doctrine of Christ as the common Head and Redeemer, was able to organize a community in which there was neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, all being one in Christ Jesus. The dream of Stoicism would forever have continued a dream, the foundations of the universal State would never have been found, had not Christ come to establish the divine kingdom on earth. Every view of the early history of Christianity that fails to take these considerations into account, misses the real clue to what it seeks to explain. Nearly a hundred years ago Gibbon undertook, in his famous 15th and 16th chapters, to set forth the proximate causes of the rapid diffusion of the Christian religion. When his list of causes is analyzed, one sees that it comprises certain articles of belief, qualities of character and institutions, which are themselves due to Christianity. They are a part of the legitimate and peculiar excellence of the Gospel. The solution comes to this, that Christianity owes its success to itself. Every similar attempt to cast into the shade the original and unique character of this religion, in which lay the secret of its power, must have a like result. Food is adapted to still the pangs of hunger, but hunger cannot create food.

Much that Renan says of the prospects of Christianity in relation to the laws and policy of the Roman government is well said, and is supported by the best authorities. Whether, and how far, the ancient heathen nations were tolerant, is a question that has been long discussed. This point is settled, that a respect for the rights of conscience and a toleration founded on this feeling, were unknown to the statesmen of antiquity. Each nation had its gods, and might worship them without molestation. Under polytheism the Pantheon is capacious enough to admit any number of divinities. But there were two great restrictions upon liberty of worship. A man might not forsake the worship of his nation, or bring in strange gods. A religion, generally speaking, was safe as long as it refrained from being aggressive. The Jewish religion, a pure monotheism, was necessarily exclusive; and for this reason was gen-

erally odious to the Romans. Christianity was of necessity both aggressive and exclusive. It sought to supplant the religion of the State, and was, therefore, certain to be treated as an enemy. Renan has spoken of the strong tendency to the establishment of sodalities, and to the repressive policy of the imperial government. The laws against illicit assemblies might, at any time, be enforced against Christians. There is, moreover, another essential fact in connection with this subject, and this we do not observe that Renan brings out with proper distinctness. As long as the Christians were so few or obscure as to be confounded with the Jews, they were under the shield which the Roman law threw over a national religion,—over *religiones licitæ*. But when Christianity was seen to be a distinct religion, to which the Jews were even hostile, it had no legal protection. It was proved that Christians could never be permanently safe from persecution at the hands of magistrates, until their religion was enrolled among the *religiones licitæ*, as a recognized, lawful form of worship. A series of bloody persecutions lay between the infant church and this goal of security.

In the present volume, Renan follows the Apostolic History from the year 33 to the year 45. The missionary labors of the Apostle Paul are reserved for a subsequent work.

ARTICLE VII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

ECCE HOMO.*—"What think ye of Christ?" We have, in this popular volume, one more attempt to answer this old but ever fresh and momentous question. It is a work characterized by no special learning in theology, and by a careful avoidance of the technical phraseology of theological science. No original conceptions of Christian doctrine are presented on its pages. As a statement of the fundamental principles of Christianity, it is extremely defective. Yet it is a book of singular power and attractiveness, written in a style of classical purity and remarkable fascination, and abounding in original and beautiful suggestions. It is more inspiring than instructive, less solid than it is awakening and stimulating. Whatever influence it exerts will be exerted soon, for it is not one of those works which are destined to live and to mould theological opinion. The principal office of Christ, as far as this volume defines his work in the world, is said to be his legislative office. The elements of this peculiar office are set forth with rare eloquence, and frequently with profound truth. But the giving of an exalted and apparently exclusive place to this particular function of the Saviour is a part of the Socinian scheme, and is in conflict with the evangelical interpretation of the Gospel. Such a view was advocated by Locke, and has been often reproduced, and as often confuted, by theological writers since his time. The exegesis of this anonymous writer is apt to be faulty, and, in some cases, is despicably so,—as in his interpretation of the title "Lamb of God," and his treatment of the passage relating to the woman taken in adultery.

One of the most striking and truly valuable parts of "Ecce Homo" is the discussion of the difference between the method of Christ and the Gospel, and that of human philosophy,—the working force of the former being placed in *personal influence* as contrasted with the operation of abstract truth upon the understand-

* *Ecce Homo*. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866. 16mo. pp. 356. New Haven: Judd & Clark. Price \$1.50.

ing. The distinction is justly taken and impressively supported. The remarks upon the mode in which Christianity conquers evil propensities by the expulsive power of new and higher feelings are, also, profound.

The chief defect of "Ecce Homo" is the humanitarian view of the essence of the Gospel, which it presents, together with the ignoring of the Saviour's higher, Divine nature. The "enthusiasm of humanity" is a not very felicitous synonym of warm-hearted philanthropy; and this is declared to be the sum and substance of the teaching of Christianity. This statement is, in our judgment, fatally erroneous. Piety, in the Saviour's eye, is not less essential than philanthropy. Love to God is the *first* and great commandment. To bring men to the Father, to re-connect the soul of man with God, to lay the foundations of a reconciliation between earth and heaven, is the great work of Christ. The power of the Gospel in producing philanthropic sentiment and action lies chiefly in the distinctively religious elements that belong to it. This fact is attested by history. Our author has almost ignored the foremost and grandest feature of the religion of Christ,—that, in truth, which makes it a *religion*—that feature which is the very storehouse and hiding-place of its power. The Holy Spirit is likewise resolved away into a figurative designation of the new enthusiasm which awoke in the hearts of the Apostles after the departure of their Master.

Had the author of "Ecce Homo" explicitly recognized the truths of the Incarnation and the Mission of the Spirit, he would only have ennobled his own representations of the Saviour and His work. The possession, on the part of Christ, of extraordinary powers—powers far transcending those of other men—accompanied by a renunciation of their use, and a humble, submissive spirit in his intercourse with men, constituted, says our author, his preëminent attraction in the eyes of his disciples. But this peculiar quality of Christ begins further back; and it is enhanced a thousand-fold, when the truth is recognized that, being "in the form of God," *he took on him the form of a servant.* An explicit acknowledgment of the Incarnation would have required a view of the excellence of Jesus, which is not dissimilar in kind from that presented so forcibly by the author of "Ecce Homo," but lies, if we may so say, on the same line. So, if the mission of the Spirit had been regarded as a great fact, and as a part of the augmented personal agency and influence of Christ in consequence of his glorification

and ascension to the heavenly life, the author would not have contradicted, but would only have carried out, his own conception of the source of the Saviour's power over men. "Ecce Homo" is one of those works which might be very much praised, or very much censured, and yet no injustice be done. Our judgment is that the striking merits that undeniably belong to it, and which strongly impress the cultivated and candid reader, have led to a higher estimate of its excellence and importance than is deserved.

FAIRBAIRN ON PROPHECY.*—Dr. Fairbairn is already known to the American public as a writer on Biblical subjects, and his former works have been favorably received. The present volume, which is reprinted from the second and revised Edinburgh edition, contains a thorough examination of the subject of prophecy, both as to its general principles and as to the application of those principles to the question of past or future fulfillments of the prophetic writings. The author rejects altogether the fanciful interpretations, which would determine events with the utmost minuteness as answering to the Old Testament passages, or would assign the day or year of great future crises. But, on the other hand, he recognizes fully the supernatural and divine influence inspiring the writers, and presses the evidence for the Divine authority of the Scriptures which is drawn from the accomplishment in the world's history of the early predictions. Those who are familiar with the author's works, which have been already published in this country, will need no assurance that he is a thorough and scholarly man, and that this treatise, like the others, is well worthy of their perusal.

LANGE'S CRITICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND HOMILETICAL COMMENTARY.
—VOL. II. **MARK AND LUKE.**†—In the New Englander for Jan-

* *Prophecy viewed in respect to its Distinctive Nature, Special Function, and Proper Interpretation.* By PATRICK FAIRBAIRN, D. D., Principal of the Free Church College, Glasgow; Author of "Typology of Scripture," "Ezekiel and the Book of his Prophecy," etc. New York: Carlton & Porter. 1866. 8vo. pp. 524.

† *A Commentary on the Holy Scriptures; Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical, with special references to Ministers and Students.* By JOHN PETER LANGE, D. D., in connection with a number of eminent European Divines. Translated from the German, and edited with additions, original and selected, by PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D., in connection with American Divines of various evangelical denominations. Vol. II. of the New Testament; containing the Gospel according to Mark and the

uary, 1865, we noticed, at some length, the first volume of this work, containing the author's annotations on the Gospel of Matthew. After an interval of nearly eighteen months, the second volume has been issued from the press. It includes the commentary on the Gospels of Mark and Luke—the Edinburgh translation of the former having been revised by Dr. Shedd, of Union Theological Seminary in New York, and the latter having been translated anew, in part by Dr. Schaff, but mostly by Rev. Charles C. Starbuck. It will scarcely be necessary for us to add anything to what has been already said in respect to the earlier volume, for the general plan, style, and character of the commentary is the same throughout all the Gospels. It supplies a want which has been widely felt by ministers in our country, and we are sure the new volume will meet as ready a sale among them as the one which they have already examined and have found so useful. If the distinguished author had extended the critical and exegetical part of the work, and had compressed the doctrinal and ethical as well as the homiletical and practical parts within somewhat narrower limits, we think he would have rendered a greater service to Biblical learning. But perhaps those, a large part of whose use of a commentary is for the purpose of gaining suggestions of thought for public discourse, will not be disposed to agree with us in the expression of this view. Without desiring to call any very special attention to this fault—if, indeed, the general voice would pronounce it to be such—we cheerfully commend the volume to our readers, and we assure them that the price, though higher than we could wish it was, is not greater than the value of what the volume contains would justify.

WHEDON'S COMMENTARY ON LUKE AND JOHN.*—The design of this volume—the second in the series of Dr. Whedon's commentaries—is to supply a place for his own denomination, which is filled in the Congregational and Presbyterian Churches by the well-known and much-used commentaries of Albert Barnes. It seems to be prepared with much care, and exhibits the result of scholarly investigation to a greater degree than its unpretending character

Gospel according to Luke. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$5. 1866. 8vo. pp. 585.

* *Commentary on the Gospels; Intended for Popular Use.* By Rev. D. D. WHEDON, D. D.—Luke and John.—New York: Carlton and Porter. 1866. 12mo. pp. 422.

would lead one to anticipate. We can scarcely suppose that it will be used, to any considerable extent, outside of the circle for which it was especially designed, and yet Sabbath School teachers and others, who desire brief and concise annotations on the Gospels to aid them in their studies and instructions, will find much in this work that will be useful to them.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST.*—This little volume has already been published in part at least by the American Tract Society and in its chief peculiarities is not unknown to the public. It is a comprehensive and exhaustive argument for the Divinity of our Lord, drawn from the internal evidence which the evangelical history and the history of the church furnish when taken in their connection. The argument is finished by a series of replies to all sorts of objections—and particularly to the counter theories of Strauss and Renan. To this is appended a collection of the testimonies of unbelievers, beginning with Pontius Pilate and his wife, and ending with Frances Power Cobbe. The work is learned, yet perfectly simple. It is sober and plain, yet not uninteresting. It is serious and correct without cant or sermonizing. It is fitted to be eminently useful, and we bespeak for it the attention of the clergy and others who are brought in contact with the vague but pretentious infidelity of the times.

THE SHADOW OF CHRISTIANITY.†—The author of this little volume is a strong and sound thinker, and a bold writer. In these few unpretending papers, written originally for the columns of a newspaper, during the crisis of our late war, there is more solid Christian statesmanship and profound political philosophy than are embodied in many an elaborate treatise, or specious statepaper. His views of the Christian Church are thoroughly spiritual. His views of the simplicity of its organization and the autonomy of its government are derived from the model given in the New Testament. His theory of the relation which the Church holds to the State recognizes the essential independence of each upon the other,

* *The Person of Christ*: The Miracle of History—with a Reply to Strauss and Renan, and a collection of Testimonies of Unbelievers. By PHILIP SCHAFF, D. D. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. 18mo pp. 375. New Haven: Judd & White.

† *The Shadow of Christianity*; or the Genesis of the Christian State. A Treatise for the Times. By the Author of the "Apocalastasis." New York: Hurd & Houghton. 24mo. pp. 167.

in respect to authority and support, and the practical dependence of the State upon the Church for all that makes the State healthful or valuable. Hence the significance of the title, "The Shadow of Christianity." The work is divided into the following chapters:—The Church, The Commonwealth, The Pagan State, The Christian State, The American Republic. A copy of this book would be a not unsuitable present to every legislator in our land. Were its principles carefully pondered, and thoroughly accepted, it would make our politicians more intelligent as well as more honest.

GOULBURN'S "IDLE WORD."*—There is an unfortunate appropriateness in the title of this little book. It will ordinarily be quoted as we have here given it, and in that form expresses an opinion which we fear will be generally entertained as to the value and efficiency of the work. The author's books, which have been republished in this country, have been a descending series. The "Thoughts on Personal Religion," we still value as highly as at first. The "Idle Word" seems to have less of valuable and original thought than either of its predecessors.

"Method," says Lord Bacon, "carrying a show of total and perfect knowledge, has a tendency to generate acquiescence." Our author, who quotes from that work of Bacon in which these words occur, seems to have taken these "pregnant words" for a commendation of method. He has fallen into the error which they condemn. Another and more serious fault is the use of analogy as if it were always argument. The whole third chapter (and the note to chapter VIII) is full of analogies, distorted and pressed beyond their points of contact. It contains, too, a most absurd argument for the Trinity—God is Love; but love implies more than one person: hence there is more than one person in God. We should be much happier, and Christianity would be much stronger, if two things could be done away,—pulpit logic, with which this book overflows, and Christian illiberality. The tirade against modern liberality (pp. 50-52, Am. ed.) is a good (and bad) example of the latter, the only one we notice in the book.

There is much else in it to condemn, but also much to praise.

* *The Idle Word*: Short religious essays upon the gift of Speech and its employment in conversation. By EDWARD MEYTRICK GOULBURN, D. D. New York: D. Appleton and Co. New Haven: H. C. Peck. 1866. Price \$1.25.

The sermon at the end is perhaps the best thing in it; admirably direct, practical, and, for once, logical. We recommend also chapters vi., vii., ix., and x.

INGHAM ON BAPTISM.*—This large octavo volume attempts to give a presentation of the argument on the Baptist side of this great subject. The author, who is a pastor of a church in Todmorden in England, was moved to undertake the work by seeing two volumes bearing upon the other side of the controversy, which had been recently published—one of them by a prominent Methodist gentleman, and the other under the auspices of the Congregational Union of England. He was, therefore, led to take the position of an advocate and to contend against opponents in a greater degree than might naturally have been the case, if he had proposed to himself only a general treatise on Baptism. The main part of the volume, indeed,—some four hundred pages,—is taken up with the answering of objections of all sorts; and the continual repetition of remarks concerning “the influence of prejudice,” etc, shows that the adversaries are never for a moment forgotten. The author himself admits that a handbook so controversial as this is very undesirable, but believes it to be necessary, so long as the present mode of defense is continued upon the other side. We cannot but think, that the book would have been more valuable, if it had been less of this character. But the reader who has the patience to go through, or the skill judiciously to pass over, those passages or pages which deal with the two writers above referred to, or with others of the same party, will hardly fail to feel that the author has set forth, with much fullness, the views of his own church, and has been quite exhaustive in searching out all the points of objection. Those who desire to have at hand the Baptist argument may find it for their interest to look into this book with a view to purchasing it.

BAKER'S SERMONS.†—We have read the memoir in this volume with intense but mournful interest. Our interest was in part excited by our personal knowledge of the religious history of the

* *A Handbook on Christian Baptism.* By R. INGHAM. London: Simpkin, Marshall & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 624.

† *Sermons of the Rev. Francis A. Baker, Priest of the Congregation of St. Paul, with a memoir of his life.* By Rev. A. F. HAWIT. New York: Lawrence Koehe. 1866. 12mo. pp. 504.

author, and of his strange wanderings from the simplicity of the gospel. We seem to read upon every page and in almost every sentence an explanation if not a vindication of the reasons which led him step by step to accept the authority of the Bishop of Rome as the ruler of his heart and conscience, and the *dogmas* of the Romish Church as decisive of his personal faith. In recording the struggles of Father Baker, Father Hewit has transcribed the recollections of his own. In stating at length the arguments which decided Father Baker with much hesitation and after long delays to enter the Romish communion, he but recapitulates the reasons which once moved himself to a similar decision. In dwelling upon the sacrifices and sorrows which this decision involved, and the fancied peace and satisfaction with which it was followed, he gives us the story of his own trials, and, as he fancies it, of his own exceeding joy, at finding repose at last in the bosom of "the church."

There is also inwrought into this biography an argument very skillfully adapted to affect powerfully many Protestants, whose views of the nature of the church and of the ministry are like those which were entertained by Fathers Baker and Hewit before they exchanged the name of Protestant for that of Romanist. It is very obvious that this memoir was not designed so much to commemorate Father Baker as it was to present satisfactory reasons why all Anglo-Catholics should become Roman Catholics. These reasons derive all their power to convince from the assumption that the true church can only be one, as it is united in a single organization under officers who derive their authority from the Apostles in a direct line of succession, and that their authority alone gives efficiency to the sacraments and other ministrations of grace and salvation.

At the time when we were reading this memoir, we happened to open a "Hobart's Companion for the Altar," a book which was formerly esteemed high authority among many Episcopalians in this country. In the preface, the Bishop thus expresses himself: "In the following pages, the writer has endeavored to keep in view two principles which he deems most important and fundamental. These principles are: That we are saved from the guilt and dominion of sin by the divine merits and grace of a crucified Redeemer; and that the merits and grace of the Redeemer are applied to the soul of the believer, in the devout and humble participation of the ordinances of the church, administered by a priesthood who derive their authority by regular transmission from

Christ the Divine Head of the Church, and the source of all the power in it." It is to those who accept these principles that the argument of Father Hewit addresses itself. They only can be affected by it. To them the question is a very serious one, where can I find "the priesthood that derives its authority by regular transmission from the church?" Which is the church, "by the participation of whose ordinances, the merits and grace of the Redeemer are applied to the soul." Is it the Anglican body that was broken off from Rome by the parliament of Henry VIII., and organized under the direction of Elizabeth, whose bond of union in this country is the House of Bishops, which house was violently rent in twain at the fancy of those "successors of the Apostles," who resided in the Confederate States? or is it the one body that is held together by the headship of the Bishop of Rome and the outward and continuous unity of which is no matter of doubt since the time of the Apostles? To persons to whom these are serious questions, the argument of Father Hewit is a serious argument, but to none others. To those who reject this conception of the church, and the sacraments, and the priesthood, and the transmission of authority, and of saving virtue, it has no force whatever. To the man who interprets the words of Christ aright, "where two or three are gathered in my name there am I in the midst of them," its reiterations are as powerless as "the blowing of smoke through a gun-barrel."

We are told on the title page and in the memoir that Father Baker is "a priest of the congregation of St. Paul." This is a society chiefly devoted to missionary work. It holds missions of several days in continuance in all the large towns, in which there are meetings, early and late, for confession, for communion, for meditation, and for preaching. To these missions the "young fathers," who have founded this society, devote themselves with laborious and praiseworthy zeal. In the sermons which they prepare and preach, if we may judge from the specimens in this volume and in the several series previously published, from which these are taken, there is used great plainness of speech and unflinching fidelity in reproof. Many of the truths and claims of the gospel are urged with admirable point and force. In form and in much of their matter, these are model sermons. The zeal, and patience, and fidelity, and missionary enterprise of the members of this society, are all worthy of the name of the Apostle whose name it bears. But the gospel which they preach, in its principal features, is anything but

the gospel according to Paul. Christ is not in it the object of supreme affection and trust. Were the Holy Apostle to visit the earth and to read these sermons and this memoir, one would think that the first thing which he would do, would be to send this "congregation" an epistle not unlike that which he once sent to "the churches of Galatia," beginning as did that: "I marvel you are so soon removed from him that called you into the grace of Christ, into another gospel, which is not another." As he should read Father Hewit's discourses about lovely altars and places of devotion, decorated with flowers, furnished with all the accessories of stately and sensuous worship, and mark how much he makes of these and how little of Christ Himself, the spiritual Head, he would break forth with the indignant inquiry: "O foolish Paulists, who hath bewitched you, that you should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" "Are ye so foolish, having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh?" "Ye observe days and months, and times and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain."

JEHOVAH-JIREH.*—It has, for several years, been a serious question with us, whether or not it is a misfortune to have a mind so constituted as to be incapable of being positively interested in books or discourses, unless they have in them something that is positively interesting. There are so many things said and written in the world, which are all so very true and very good and even very religious, that it seems as if it would be highly proper and fitting to be awakened or edified by them. A great many persons, who are engaged in saying and writing them, appear to be greatly impressed—indeed, they often declare, in so many words, that they are so—and then, too, a great many other persons, who are listeners or readers, are much affected and are ready to make them the daily food by which they sustain their mental or spiritual life. A good brother, for example, rises in some assembly, and tells us a story, which has rested upon his mind, with the utmost solemnity, ever since he was himself an actor in it in his boyhood—and he is, in all probability, seventy-five years of age now; another gathers up his thoughts of past years, which he has several times, perhaps, presented to his own friends or congregation, and, with a confi-

* *Jehovah-Jireh*; a Treatise on Providence. By WILLIAM S. PLUMER, D.D. L.L.D. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 232.

dence that he is going to strengthen many souls, and a prayer that his confidence may not be disappointed, he publishes a book on some great subject of this world or the future. Part of the assembly are in tears, or leave the place of meeting with the feeling that they are really quickened in the way of a better life; multitudes of the larger audience, to whom the author speaks, read and re-read, mark, learn, and inwardly digest, and even think what a blessing has been vouchsafed to them in the very fact that such an author has been moved to write such a book. It would be highly gratifying if we could only find in ourselves the capacity of being similarly affected. We have, sometimes, tried to run back through our past experience, and thus to see if we could recall any time, when such a story as the one we have heard, in the case supposed, would have really excited us. But, after patient searching—though we confess ourselves unable, indeed, to recollect with distinctness anything back of the age of six years—we have been compelled to admit that the inability is something which appertains to our own mind, and to give over the hope that it will ever be otherwise. Is it not a misfortune? And yet one's own mental constitution is a thing one cannot change, and, if it is a misfortune, we must bear with it as best we can. It is better even thus than it might be. We can well remember the time when we feared that it was not a mental misfortune but a moral fault. Of late, however, we are happy in the escape from this fear, for it is really astonishing to us to find how many persons, of undoubted Christian character and of mature and even advancing age, there are about us, who wish the *Missionary Herald* itself—that well-known and long-honored journal which brings us all the tidings that we receive from the field of foreign mission service—might sometimes give us the more juicy and less solemn parts of the letters that are continually coming homeward, and thus might add a new interest to its valuable pages. And we are sure there are many minds which regard the distinctively religious parts of certain magazines as less interesting, because less stimulating, than they might be. It is comforting to know by such examples, and examples, too, of people whom we had always believed to be entirely unconscious of such thoughts or feelings, that the thing which has troubled us is not a certain evidence of a want of piety. It is, however, clearly evidence of a peculiar kind of mind, and, perhaps, we are disqualified thereby from judging what will please or benefit the world in general.

We have been led to give expression to these thoughts by a perusal of the book, whose title stands at the beginning of this notice. The venerable author has, as we presume, collected the thoughts of several of his past sermons on the subject of Divine Providence, and has put them together in a single volume, making a treatise on this grand and all-important theme. We have no doubt that hundreds of persons, into whose hands the volume may fall, will be edified by reading it, and will feel that the author has said everything that could be said upon the subject. We think it quite probable that many Christian souls will be grateful for the comforting, and evangelical, and orthodox views which he has presented before them. We are not sure but some may be quickened in mind even, and inspired with new thought, as they follow him through his eighteen chapters. But we must confess that to us the book seems to be thoroughly common-place, and one which might, perhaps, quite as well not have been written. The Providence of God is one of the grandest themes of human meditation; it is one which presses itself upon the thought of every serious mind, more and more, as years pass on; it is one the contemplation of which is a matter of rejoicing to every believing and reverent soul. It is a subject, moreover, which takes hold upon the richest part of the inmost life and experience of every individual among us. The providential dealing of God with every one, so marvelous in its wisdom and goodness, must be, as it would seem, to every one's own mind (if he will open his thoughts to consider it), a stronger and more irresistible proof of God's being and of His ceaseless love, than any which can be brought from the world without him. We stand to-day, ourselves, and look back over the two, or ten, or twenty years that are past, and the wonderful guidance by which God has led us forward; the strange orderings of life; the strange interpositions, coming so often at the most critical moment, and in the most unexpected manner; the hidden workings in the distant past, the minglings, and inter-twinings, and overrulings through all the way, and the beautiful unfolding of all at the end; these things fill the soul as much with richness of thought, as they do with fullness of thanksgiving. And our whole life seems, thus, to become pervaded and filled with the presence and the thoughts of God. When, therefore, we take up a book on such a subject as this, which gives us only common places, which tells us nothing that was not the accepted, ordinary, fundamental, as well as most general truth before our own mind

twenty years ago, and which must, one would think, have been, in the same way, before every reflective mind, we feel that the author,—having passed, as he has, through life's experience to its latest period,—might have presented us with something richer and fresher, and more, in its impressiveness, like the Providence of which it speaks; or that, if he had nothing of this character to give us, he might almost as well have kept his thoughts to himself.

But then we think of the question with which we began, and it presents itself in a new form before us. Is it not, after all, our own fault, and not Dr. Plumer's? Is not the misfortune of the case, not that he wrote and published his book, but that it fell to our lot to notice it? Perhaps the author will, when he prepares a new edition, devote a page or two to this new illustration of the strangeness with which events are ordered in this world; though we think he will, more probably, if these words fall under his eye, find in them a new example of the false notions of New England.

We have made no quotations from the volume, for we have scarcely known where to begin, and have had no wish or space to make a critical examination of the book. We have no desire to hinder any one from reading it. So far from this, we cheerfully commend it to all those whose minds are not like our own,—and they are a pretty large number here, as well as everywhere else. We beg permission, however, to call attention for a moment to the fact, that, in his remarks on the providential dealings of God with nations, the author does not make any allusion to the striking history of the past few years, but confines himself to other times, and mainly to the remote past. It would have been very natural—so it appears to us—especially as he urges the American people to consider and “beware,” to have called their thought to the wonderful way in which God has made sin punish itself within this land, after so long a period of misrule and oppression. But we suppose he preferred to be like the good minister, who edified his congregation greatly by being “very severe upon the Jews;” and, if we are not in error, the author, during these late years, has reserved his severity chiefly for those historic offenders.

Our notice has passed already the limits which we had assigned to it, but as we have said so much which may be looked upon as finding fault either with the author or with our own mind, we desire, ere we close, to express our grateful acknowledgments to the author—and the hearty assent of our own mind, also, to his view—for a remark which we met in the last book of his that it was

our privilege to see, viz.: that while there is a divinely-imposed obligation upon children to obey their parents, there is none whatever to obey their aunts, and uncles, and grandmothers, and every other older person who may chance to live in the same house with their parents. The "permissive" providence by which children are often, or we may say always, subjected to commands and endless lecturings from the people of the next preceding generation, who either have no business at all to interfere with them, or to whom no "directive providence" has given rightful authority over them, would be an interesting additional chapter in this volume, and we should be glad to furnish for it a few "impressive stories" from our own experience.

VIEWS OF PROPHECY.*—This duodecimo volume of ninety-four pages, according to the statement of the preface, contains the substance of a short course of lectures delivered to a limited audience, some of whom have expressed a wish to possess them in a permanent form. It has reference to the prophecies concerning the second coming of Christ and the restoration of the Jews; and, though the author makes no claim to superior learning, or to have said in his book anything which has not been better said by others, he yet puts it forth with the hope, that it may induce the Christians of this country to study these prophecies more carefully, and to correct what he believes to be their wrong views. He begins by describing briefly the peculiar history and present condition of the Jewish people; and then declares that the great difficulty in the way of the conversion of that portion of this remarkable people, who are now to be found within the limits of Protestant countries, is the virtual denial of the prophecies in regard to them by Protestants,—that is, the denial that Christ is to appear personally and reign over them, and the attempt to explain the passages of the Scriptures which refer to these subjects, as having reference only to the general extension of religion throughout the world. The change from the literal to the spiritual interpretation is the one thing which destroys the power of the Christian to influence and persuade the unconverted Jew. Having thus set forth what he conceives to be the great mistake of our churches and preachers in regard to this matter, he tries to defend the literal method of interpreting the Bible, citing examples from the Old

* *Views of Prophecy concerning the Jews, the Second Advent, and the Millennium.* By a Layman. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 94.

Testament, and applies the same to the prophetic declarations in respect to Christ's coming in the New Testament. The subject as thus developed occupies the first four chapters of the volume; the three remaining ones discuss the evidence from Scripture that the earth will never be destroyed, but will be the future residence of the saints, and then consider the objections to the doctrine of a personal reign, the testimony of the primitive church, &c., &c.

We have thus given a very brief sketch of the topics upon which the author treats, and in the order in which they are taken up and examined, and, in our sketch, we have followed in large measure his own language. The book is one of so few pages, that any one could read it in a couple of hours, and is so small that any one, even of most limited means, could easily purchase it. In regard to the matter of advising our readers either to purchase and read it, or to agree with the views which it presents;—we hardly feel at liberty to say anything *against* such a course, for the author closes his preface with the significant words, "To such of our clergy as violently oppose these ancient and venerable doctrines, I commend the words of the sage Gamaliel, 'If this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought, but if it be of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God;'"—while, on the other hand, it seems unnecessary for us to say anything *in favor* of such a course, for we may point to our example, which is surely better than words, and may, with satisfaction, declare that we have read the book ourselves. We can only leave our readers, therefore, to do, in this matter, what will, doubtless, both here and everywhere else, be most agreeable to themselves,—namely, to do just what they please.

We feel impelled, however, before parting company with the worthy layman, who has written this volume, to add, that, whatever may be the success with which he has advocated his own particular opinions respecting the coming millennium, we think he fully establishes the view that the millennium has not begun already, in the following brief paragraph:

"I once examined a learned and voluminous commentary on the Apocalypse, in which the author endeavored to prove that the millennium commenced a long time since, and is now in full career. Although this strange fancy has been held by various writers, ever since the days of Constantine, it can hardly be necessary to waste argument upon it in America. If the devil has been chained throughout the last four years, during the flagrant sins of the

camp and the march, the bloody carnage of battles and sieges, the murderous massacres of the border guerillas, and the cruel tortures of Belle Isle and Andersonville, what can he do worse when 'loosed for a season?'"

And the array of statistics, which he brings forward, as showing that the world is now gradually moving on toward a coming spiritual millennium,—the 150,000 habitual gin drinkers, &c., &c. in London, and the four or five-fold greater proportionate increase of Roman Catholics in this country of late years, as compared with other denominations,—does not appear very hopeful. Still the world does seem to us, on the whole, to grow better, and the worthy statistical Christian brother, whom we recently met, who—on the ground that the missionaries of the American Board do not convert, on an average, more than one and a half heathen annually, while the annual increase of heathen by birth, according to his calculations, is six millions,—concluded that the good cause would run behindhand steadily and dreadfully, until the Missionary Societies should send out four million missionaries in a year, and, even then, would make no advance, but would only provide for the yearly increase, leaving the old mass of the heathen still unconverted and unmoved, did seem to us,—though we are always greatly appalled by statistics,—to take a somewhat unnecessarily discouraging and gloomy view.

PHILOSOPHICAL AND SCIENTIFIC.

RUSH'S ANALYSIS OF THE HUMAN INTELLECT.*—Those of our readers who have known the author through his "Philosophy of the Human Voice" would naturally expect to find in this book much that is worthy of consideration. We dare not say that they will be entirely disappointed, but we are quite confident that this treatise will never take the relative place in psychology, or in the estimation of the public, which his work on the human voice has gained for itself. The author very quietly announces that he allowed fifty years in which the world might discover the merits

* *Brief Outline of an Analysis of the Human Intellect*; intending to rectify the scholastic and vulgar perversions of the natural purpose and method of thinking; by rejecting altogether the theoretic confusion, the unmeaning arrangement, and indefinite nomenclature of the metaphysicians. In two volumes. By JAMES RUSH, M. D., author of the "Philosophy of the Human Voice." Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1865. 8vo. pp. 450—480. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$7.50.

of the earlier work, and is quite content to wait three hundred, for the proper appreciation and acceptance of the doctrines of the later. This proposition is a better illustration of the author's patience than it is of his modesty. But we will not quarrel with him upon such a matter, which is comparatively of minor importance. The only important inquiry for us to agitate is, what are the real excellencies of this work which the world is likely to discover and acknowledge in the course of the next two hundred and ninety-nine years?

One need not go beyond the title page to learn that metaphysicians are the objects of the author's most contemptuous detestation, and that he aims to displace both them and their works by better methods of inquiry than those which they adopt, and by more satisfactory results. But who in his view is a metaphysician, we are prompted to ask? We find, in answer, every one who does not believe that the mind is physical in its essence, and that its phenomena are to be explained by agencies and laws that are physical. This is sufficiently explicit and not a little startling. Lest we should be accused of overstating or of misapprehending his meaning, we cite his own words. "The following method of investigating the mind, from the beginning to the end of its few and simple functions, is conducted on the ground of their being altogether a physical action of the senses and the brain." As we look further, "the human mind is an effect of the organization of the senses and the brain. This mental function is governed by laws similar to those of other physical phenomena." As we proceed, the author proposes to substitute cerebral for mental action. These cerebral actions are five-fold—viz., primary, memorial, joint, conclusive, and verbal. The first, the primary, are, of course, physical impressions in the way of vibration, or otherwise upon the nervous tissue. The memorial by which the original impression is revived or recalled does not so readily suggest its explanation—by the author's general theory. We look carefully in his book to find what he will say. He thus defines them: "Memorial perceptions are the images and types of objects and actions on the brain once respectively before the eye, and on the other senses, but now removed; or more briefly, they are perceptions without the presence of their external causative objects. They are fainter than the primary, but the images derived from sight have still their outline, form, color, and motion. There is the like faintness, in the types, however these may exist or act on the brain. *From an an-*

alogy that cannot be controverted, we infer; the memorial perceptions are excited upon some delicate but unobvious organization of the brain; and *having regarded the primary as physical functions, we must further infer with strong probability*, from the homogeneous structure of the sensuous nerves and the brain, and from the correspondence of the images and types with their external things, excepting a fainter degree of the memorial, *that until the contrary is proved, the memorial are equally a material process,*" &c. We have quoted these extraordinary sentences so as to exhibit the theory of the author in his own language, and we have given in italics those portions which exhibit the ground or reason on which, or the steps of inference by which he reaches his results. There is certainly nothing novel in all this. The only thing extraordinary is that the author should not have been aware that this has been urged in utterances thousands of years ago. He need not have given the world three hundred years to think and receive propositions like these. It has already been thinking of them for three thousand years, and has, thus far, at least, not accepted them as true. Even "Mr. Robert Blakey's learned analysis of all the noted metaphysical writers on the mind, from the earliest times," might have furnished some hints that the theory has been suggested before.

There is one suggestion, however, which we will concede is novel and entirely original with the author; and that is, that it may be reserved for the future discoverer to trace, by the aid of powerful microscopes, all the processes of cerebral activity, so that it can be demonstrated to the eyesight that every so-called mental process is but some action of brain tissue. Upon this point we agree with the author: "*we leave it*, therefore, to future discoverers of an enlarged and piercing method of vision, and to the observing, experimenting, and reflecting physiologist, not to dodge among cerebral fibres and cells, after an invisible and trackless spirit; but to trace and describe the physical forms, motions, successions, and combinations of images and types in the working-place of the brain; thus spreading over the mind a descriptive panorama of its material self."

We would guard against one conclusion which might be hastily drawn from the account which we have given of this book, and the extracts which we have made from its pages. That conclusion is that the book is dull and spiritless, as books of gross materialism usually are. It is anything but dull. It is sparkling with spirit

and ebullient with life. There is scarcely a single page on which the author does not overflow with the most refreshing denunciations of metaphysicians, which are the chief objects of his caustic attacks—with them are freely associated demagogues, bank directors, railway managers, and a large class of nuisances of that sort. The spirit of many of these portraiture is quite enlivening. The cerebral action of the author must at times have been very violent, and under the eye of the microscopic observer it might have excited serious apprehension for the integrity of the tissues themselves.

MIND IN NATURE.*—This beautifully printed and finely illustrated volume will be valued by scientific men for the records which it furnishes and gathers up of the results of the original observations and experiments of the author; for the new contributions which it offers to the theory of classifications in zoology; and for the exquisite drawings which it contains after microscopic observations. To the general and special student alike it furnishes material for speculation and controversy by the facts alleged in support of the theory of spontaneous generation, and the very wide application of them in the way of inference in respect to the origin of new animal species at the great epochs of the world's history. The facts adduced are of two classes; those which seem to indicate that life may be developed, or recomposed after the apparent destruction of all germs of animated existence by the application of heat; and those, again, which the author claims indicate or prove that in the decomposition of masses of animated fibre, fragments of living beings are given off, which are but the germs of beings waiting to be developed or assimilated into other living beings by favoring circumstances. From these alleged facts the author concludes that spontaneous generation is possible, but the admission of its possibility in no sense militates against the theory of a personal Creator, but is equally consistent with positive Theism.

We admit the general principle of the author, that, provided the facts are made out, and all the inferences which he could derive

* *Mind in Nature*; or the origin of life, and the mode of development of animals. By HENRY JAMES CLARK, A. B., B. S., Adjunct Professor of Zoology in Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass. With over two hundred illustrations. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1865. 8vo. pp. 322. New Haven: H. C. Peck. Price \$3.00.

from them in respect to the general economy of nature, and of the working of secondary causes in nature, it would still be necessary to assume intelligence as the originator and sustainer of nature itself. We insist, with him, that no matter into how many links the chain of secondary causes is broken, the chain itself must be attached to Jupiter's chair. But we are not satisfied that the isolated facts on which he relies are made good. Nor if they were, that they are sufficient to ground the wide-reaching analogies into which he could expand them.

The volume is one of great interest and importance. We regret to observe not a few infelicities of diction, as well as, occasionally, a defective and almost confused method on the part of the author in appreciating and stating his own argument.

ESSAYS, PHILOSOPHICAL AND THEOLOGICAL. BY JAMES MARTINEAU.*—This is a very valuable and timely volume. It consists of a series of Articles published originally in the *National Review*, to which are added an Address delivered at the opening of Manchester New College, London, in 1865. The topics of these papers are as follows: Comte's Life and Philosophy, John Stuart Mill, Nature and God, Science, Nescience and Faith, Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought, Cerebral Psychology, Revelation, what it is not and what it is, Personal Influences on our present Theology, Newman—Coleridge—Carlyle, Theology in its relation to Progressive Knowledge.

It will be seen from this list of topics that the writer discusses nearly all of the most important directions and schools of speculation, which at present occupy and agitate the thinking people of England. The point of view from which he surveys and criticises them, is that of a spiritual and intuitional philosophy, as opposed to the empirical and sensuous positions of Comte, Mill, and Bain, and that of a positive apprehension of the Infinite as opposed to the limiting and nescient doctrines of Hamilton, Mansel, and Herbert Spencer. His exposition of his own views and of those of the authors whom he criticises are remarkable for clearness and vivacity, while his style often rises into great brilliancy and eloquence. We do not hold the same views with Mr. Martineau in respect to the nature or the matter of Revela-

* *Essays, Philosophical and Theological.* By JAMES MARTINEAU. Boston: William V. Spencer, 1866.

tion, but we agree with him most cordially in the most of the doctrines set forth in this volume. The clearness, brilliancy, and eloquence of the *Essays* invest it with the highest interest, while the importance of the positions which he takes against the superficial and negative views which he opposes, justify us in saying that to all persons interested in the speculative questions of the day it is one of the most valuable and seasonable volumes which have been published in this country for many years.

M'COSH'S EXAMINATION OF MILL'S PHILOSOPHY.*—Dr. M'Cosh is one of the most industrious and prompt of all English writers upon metaphysical topics. No sooner does any new doctrine or a writer with a new theory or system appear upon the speculative arena than Dr. M'Cosh takes some public notice of both doctrine and writer. He has criticised Hamilton and some points of his philosophy with great freedom and frequency. Mill, Comte, and Herbert Spencer have all of them received each in his turn ample attention from our author's critical pen, in the many papers and volumes which have been produced by his productive and ready mind. He is most sensitive to feel and ready to estimate the relation of every theory or writer to the fundamental truths of Ethics and Christian Theology. It is as regarded from this point of view that all these subjects have their chief interest and importance in his mind. In this as in many other respects he has the most imperative claims upon the respect and gratitude of all persons interested in speculative studies. Whatever comes from his pen gives evidence also of critical acumen and industrious research.

The work before us was occasioned by the very able and imposing review of Sir William Hamilton's philosophy by Mr. John Stuart Mill, which was noticed in a previous number of the *New Englander*. Dr. M'Cosh, though by no means an uncritical adherent or devotee of Hamilton's system, is a still more decided rejector of the most of the fundamental principles which Mill holds as against Hamilton. Hence he styles his critical estimate of Mill also a defense of fundamental truth. In conducting it he does not follow the precise order of topics chosen by Mill but proposes

* *An Examination of Mr. J. S. Mill's Philosophy*; being a Defense of Fundamental Truth. By JAMES M'COSH, LL. D., Professor of Logic and Metaphysics, Queen's College, Belfast; etc., etc. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers, 1866. 8vo. pp. 434. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.

and carries out an independent discussion of the principal points in discussion, after an order and method of his own. This relieves the work from any too close relation to Mill's critique, and exalts it to the dignity and interest of an independent philosophical treatise.

It is characterized by the same features which are observable in all of the writings of the author, the same excellencies and defects. Dr. M'Cosh is always clear, candid, and well informed—he is often acute and original. He is sometimes defective in precision of thought and statement and in closeness and vigor of logical connection. But he always adds something to the results of previous discussions, and hence his works are indispensable to the theological and speculative student. We hope that he will find in the interest which his works and his person awaken among us occasion for gratifying reflection—and an encouragement to labor with renewed assiduity for the large and interested circle of readers which his writings have made for themselves among us, as well as for his admirers in the mother country.

HERBERT SPENCER'S PRINCIPLES OF BIOLOGY.*—This is another volume in the series of Herbert Spencer's philosophical works. It is of course designed to illustrate and enforce the great doctrine of evolution which is the foundation principle of his whole system. The assumption of this doctrine, as explanatory of all development and every new form of being, as well as the application of it to account for every new phenomenon, must greatly diminish the philosophical value of every treatise, by this author, however, abundant are the facts which he has at command, or however appositely and readily they may be cited for his purposes. This volume is especially valuable for the complete command which it shows the author to possess over the singular facts and phenomena that are exhibited in the beginning and progress of life, and for the fairness of his mind upon every point except such as are involved in his fundamental philosophy. It is one of the most useful of the whole series, and will be highly esteemed even by those who reject the author's philosophical and theological theories.

* *The Principles of Biology.* By HERBERT SPENCER. Vol. I. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 475. New Haven: H. O. Peck. Price \$1.50.

HISTORICAL AND POLITICAL.

FROUDE'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND.*—Froude exemplifies that prevailing taste and method in historical writing, which may be termed *realistic*. The aim is to reproduce and represent a bygone state of things just as it was, after the intervening medium of modern prejudices and opinions, and traditional judgments, has been dispelled. Starting with a strong degree of historical scepticism, the writers of this school profess to explore anew the documentary and other evidence on which current beliefs respecting the past claim our credence, and to rectify, and even, in many cases, to reverse these beliefs. The admiring reader of former historians is disenchanted on seeing the characters, to whom he has paid homage, divested of the halo which they have long been permitted to wear. On the contrary, personages who have been compelled to stand, for generations, in the pillory—objects of general indignation—are delivered from their disgrace, and recommended to our esteem. It is evident that Froude is constantly actuated by the feeling that historical truth is hard to be reached, and that it is always difficult, and not always possible, to clear away the mist which gathers over the men and transactions of a former era. Hence, while seeming to have firm judgments and, occasionally, bold and dogmatic judgments, he still not unfrequently seems to write on both sides. His strong opinions are qualified by equally strong concessions. His tone appears to imply a lively sense, on his part, of the danger of falling into hasty conclusions, and conclusions that lack the support of positive evidence.

Froude writes under the influence of a prior, well-defined conviction or theory in regard to the merits of the great controversy in England in the first age of the Reformation. He is a champion of the Tudor policy, of the *via media* by which Henry VIII. sought to establish the religious independence of England without adopting the peculiar doctrines that gave life to the Protestant movement in other countries. Froude has no special sympathy, he manifests an indifference and, occasionally, a repugnance, for the distinctive creed of the zealous Protestant leaders during the

* *History of England*; from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V. and VI. 12mo. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

reigns which he commemorates. Detesting the Papacy as a foreign power, claiming the allegiance of England, and having no sympathy with Roman Catholic abuses, whether of doctrine or practice, he is, nevertheless, hardly less hostile to that which he calls "enthusiasm" and "fanaticism," but which Protestants generally judge to be a warm and enlightened and courageous love of the truth, than was Hume. His peculiar position, as an advocate of the Tudor, Anglican Reformation, against both Papist and Puritan, gives him a strong bias in favor of the promoters of that peculiar type of rebellion against the Church of Rome, and especially in favor of Henry VIII. His work is a defense of the public policy and personal character of this monarch. It is not to be denied that in regard to certain transactions the conduct of Henry is placed in a more favorable light. The impeachment of the character of Anne Boleyn is sustained by a formidable array of proofs, which go far towards establishing a verdict against this much pitied Queen. At the same time, we do not think that Froude succeeds in his attempted vindication of Henry with reference to the charges commonly alleged against him. He is generally considered to have been of a tyrannical temper, and to have been indifferent to the shedding of blood. Let us consider, for a moment, two of the instances in regard to which our author sets himself against the common judgment, by which Henry is deeply condemned. The first is the case of Sir Thomas More. The genius and piety of More had made his name illustrious throughout Europe. A loyal subject of the King, but unable to approve of the measures connected with the divorce, he had chosen to retire betimes from public office to the seclusion of private life. Under the inquisitorial statute requiring that every individual who may be called upon, shall declare that the marriage of Henry with Catharine was void, this old man is summoned from his home and arraigned before the Council. He is willing to declare that the children of Anne are legal heirs to the throne, for Parliament has so declared, and Parliament, in his opinion, is authorized to regulate the succession; but he cannot, in conscience, go so far as to affirm the illegality of the former marriage. For this opinion, which he shared with the great body of the Catholic Church, he is cast into prison. Once more he is summoned to give his adhesion to the doctrine of the King's supremacy in religion, and, as a faithful Catholic must, he refuses. For this his gray head is laid on the block. It would seem to be plain that both the statutes were in-

iquitous, and that, whatever character belongs to them, the arraignment of the old statesman was a needless and gratuitous act of cruelty. Yet Henry did this deed without scruple and without compunction. And Froude gives no sign of disapproving his conduct in this transaction which, when it occurred, sent a thrill of horror through Europe. The other instance illustrative of Froude's strong bias in favor of Henry is found in the case of Cromwell. The character and public conduct of this minister are praised by the historian up to the very point where he becomes the object of partisan hatred and accusation. His wisdom, his courage, his fidelity, are constantly exhibited in the animated record of his career. Yet his bloody execution is described without a murmur of condemnation. We are given to understand that it was inevitable and right. It was, in truth, a foul act of ingratitude and cruelty, which a heart less hard than that of this blood-thirsty monarch could never have consented to perpetrate.

These remarks will convey an idea of the defects of this readable and instructive historical work. The style is excellent; the researches appear to be thorough, and there is little doubt that it will take rank among our English classics.

BROWNSON ON THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC.*—This work presents the final views of its author upon politics. He is a veteran in speculation. For a long period he has been at work in thinking, and writing on themes of the highest moment. He now feels himself to be fast anchored as regards religious questions; and on questions relating to government, he declares that the present volume will be his last, and renounces everything in his previous writings which is incompatible with its doctrines. It is a work of marked ability. It is incomparably superior in this respect to the climatic and atmospheric philosophy propounded in Draper's production on the same subject, which was reviewed in our Jan. number. Being Protestants, we dissent from some of the propositions of Dr. Brownson's book, especially from his remarks on the prospective religion of America. But we are glad that he has written, and heartily wish that more works of this kind might be produced, in which the philosophy of government, and the character of our government in particular, should be made the subject of dispassionate

* *The American Republic; its Constitution, Tendencies, and Destiny.* By O. A. BROWNSON, LL. D. New York: P. O'Shea, 104 Bleeker street. 1866. 8vo. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$3.

sionate consideration, on a platform lifted above the contentions of party. Dr. Brownson first devotes a series of chapters to an examination of the origin of government. The theories which he examines are eight in number. The doctrine that government originates in the right of a father to govern his child is sound, if the question is confined to the origin of government as a fact; for patriarchal government is the oldest. But the right of government to govern cannot be thus deduced, for the parental right itself is not ultimate or complete; the right of society is paramount to the right of the parent. The theory of the social compact is next subjected to a searching scrutiny and a complete refutation. This theory, as Dr. Brownson truly observes, was entertained more than any other by Jefferson and other statesmen of the Revolution. They derived their political theories largely from Locke and Sidney. One of the best features of the volume before us is the exposure of the fallacies and mischiefs of the social-compact theory. The third doctrine is that sovereignty is inherent in the people; not individually, but collectively, or the people as society, ordaining the constitution of the State, and defining its rights and powers. Society is a living organism, not a mere aggregation of individuals. It does not exist without individuals, but it is something more than individuals, and has rights not derived from them and which are paramount to theirs. This theory is not wrong in assuming that the people collectively are more than the people individually, or in denying that society is a mere aggregation of individuals, and has no rights but what it derives from them; but it is wrong in asserting that the people are sovereign in their own native or underived right or might. The theory would warrant an unlimited social despotism. The fourth is, the Positivist theory that government is a spontaneous development of nature—as the bee constructs her cell or the beaver builds her dam. Questions as to the origin of government, beyond the simple fact, are discarded. The general spirit of the Positivist speculations is well censured by Dr. Brownson in the passage in which he treats of this theory. Legitimate governments, it is confessed, are instituted under the natural law, but this is by no means the concession of government as a natural development. The reason and will of which the natural law is the expression, are the reason and will of God. The natural law is not a natural force developing itself in nature, like the law of generation, for instance, and therefore proceeding from God as first cause, but it proceeds from God as

final cause, and is, therefore, strictly a moral law, founding moral rights and duties. "The authority is not the authority of nature, but of Him who holds nature in the hollow of His hand." The fifth theory is that of "the divine right of kings, and passive obedience." This was the doctrine patronized by the Anglican divines under the Stuarts. It is the doctrine that the right of government is derived immediately and expressly from God, so that power cannot lawfully be wrested from those who are actually in possession of it. This theory rests on a false assumption, and is unfavorable to liberty. The sixth theory derives the civil authority from God, but through the spiritual authority. We came to this chapter with a sharpened curiosity, as we were anxious to know what Dr. Brownson, who still loves liberty, would say of a dogma which was set forth by the great Popes with vehement emphasis. He says: "Many theologians and canonists in the Middle Ages so held, and a few perhaps hold so still. The bulls and briefs of several popes, as Gregory VII., Innocent III., Gregory IX., Innocent IV., and Boniface VIII., have the appearance of favoring it." This phrase, we must say, puts the fact very mildly. After all that the Pontiffs, who are referred to, declared about the giving of the two swords—the temporal and spiritual—to Peter, and about the relation of the secular power to the spiritual as parallel with the relation of the moon to the sun, a much stronger phrase would have better represented the truth. But what does Dr. Brownson think of the theory? "This theory," he says, "has never been a dogma of the Church, nor, to any great extent, except for a brief period, maintained by theologians and canonists." From which we infer that Dr. Brownson does not accept it. The historical statements by which this remark are surrounded need much revision. "The Pope conferred the imperial dignity on Charlemagne and his successors," says our author. This the Popes are anxious to make the world believe, but they have never succeeded in the attempt. "The suzerainty of the Holy See" over different countries, of which Dr. Brownson speaks, was in most cases a usurpation and a false pretension. Such claims excited indignation and resistance in the day when they were put forward, and, generally speaking, admit of no historical vindication. The seventh theory is that of Augustine, Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmin, Suarez, and other theologians, namely, that princes derive their power from God through the people, "or that the people, though not the source, are the medium of all political authority, and therefore rulers are account-

able for the use they make of their power to both God and the people." This theory is pronounced to be essentially sound, but is defective in not explaining how authority comes from God to the people. The eighth theory is the one which Dr. Brownson adopts, and it is stated as follows: "The right of government to govern, or political authority, is derived by the collective people or society, from God through the law of nature. Supposing a political people or nation, the sovereignty rests in the community by the natural law, or the law by which God governs the whole moral creation." The nation to which sovereignty thus belongs, is providentially constituted. The State—as distinguished from the government—is not of human make, but arises in the providential order. It is not the people, considered as a collection of individuals, but the people "fixed to the soil"—the territorial people, who make up the *respublica*. Dr. Brownson is careful to distinguish his doctrine from that of "individual democracy," and from the doctrine of "socialistic democracy." These two theories are cherished by European liberals, whom this volume unsparingly condemns. It is a defect of the present work, as we think, that it fails to define sufficiently the characteristics of that "people," in whom sovereignty is supposed to be vested. And the doctrine of abolitionists is not to be confounded with European socialism. There may be a humanitarian democracy which respects both natural rights and political guarantees.

The second part of Dr. Brownson's work is devoted to the consideration of the American system of government. He maintains truly that the States comprising the Union were *never* disunited or isolated political communities. He contends, therefore, that they were never severally possessed of sovereignty; that sovereignty belongs to them as *united* States. On this subject he departs from the principles of Madison and Webster, whose reasoning he considers to be vitiated, in a degree, by the social-compact theory of government. In framing the Constitution, Dr. Brownson claims, the several States did not part with a portion of their sovereignty, creating a new sovereign distinct from themselves. No State *could* thus surrender sovereignty, for it could not give away what it did not possess. Sovereignty, before and after the framing of the Constitution, vests in the State as *united*. He even considers this theory essential, if we would make secession invalid. Here we cannot but think that his reasoning is fallacious. He affirms that a State could not part with its sovereignty except to

a sovereign already existing. Why not! Why not give existence, by an irreversible act, to a new sovereignty which absorbs a portion of the sovereignty previously existing in the parties which give being to the new State? Dr. Brownson agrees with Mr. Sumner in holding to the doctrine of "State-suicide." A State by the act of secession goes out from the Union, but thereby comes *under* the Union. It is thrown into a territorial condition. All its local laws are still in force, except so far as war abolishes them, but it has no further rights or claims as a State. We cannot, in this place, enter into the controversy upon this important question. We contend, however, that the General Government which has carried this great war to a successful termination has the rights of a conqueror, and is qualified to exact such guarantees of the rebellious district as shall ensure future tranquillity. It is not essential that an explicit provision to this effect should be found in the Constitution. It is a right founded in nature and recognized in public law. There must be a settlement after such a civil war, and to maintain that the Government at the moment of complete victory, and by that circumstance, is disarmed and disabled, except so far as the trial and punishment of individual rebels is concerned, is to set up a doctrine at war with common sense. Effectual measures of security may be adopted, sure guarantees may be extorted, and we trust that blind faith or an easy good nature, or political selfishness and cunning, will not be suffered to deprive the country of the legitimate fruits of the war.

We have not space for additional observations upon Dr. Brownson's treatise. We reiterate the expression of our satisfaction that so able and high-toned a discussion—however marred by some theoretical errors—should have been given to the public.

MISCELLANEOUS.

COMPLETE WORKS OF ARCHBISHOP HUGHES.*—The late archbishop Hughes was not a very great nor a very learned theologian. His mind was not formed for profound and subtle speculation, nor was it capable of being strongly exercised by those principles and questions which underlie and penetrate every form of

* *Complete Works of the Most Rev. John Hughes, D. D., Archbishop of New York*; comprising his Sermons, Letters, Lectures, Speeches, etc., carefully compiled from the best sources, and edited by LAWRENCE KEHOE. New York: Lawrence Kehoe. 1866. 2 vols. 8vo. pp. 668, 796.

Christian theology. He was no Aquinas nor Bellarmine, still less, was he formed by nature, by culture, or by grace, to be eminent for saintly devotion or for ecstatic rapture. He was no Thomas A. Kempis, nor Saint Bernard, nor was he inspired with a fervent care for men, like the founders of many of the monastic orders. But he was a great Ecclesiastical Prelate, made great by his eminent adaptation to the class of people that belonged to the Romish church in the dioceses which he ruled, and to the circumstances of trial and conflict by which they were surrounded. His administration was marked by great ability and eminent success. He was confronted with antagonists of great skill and intellectual power, who represented a powerful public sentiment. The political difficulties with which he was continually beset, he contrived to turn to the service of his cause, and he came at last to be acknowledged as a politician of no mean resources and no contemptible influence. He erected many churches, founded a multitude of monastic and other institutions. He was foremost to contend with every assailant of the Romish church. He was equally adroit and wiley when he addressed an Irish mob, who came directly from plunder and murder to the threshold of his palace, partly in defiance, partly in fear; and when he entered the lists with a skillful and plain spoken writer or preacher who uttered plain truth that carried the convictions of all but the bigoted.

His collected writings are of no inconsiderable value, containing as they do the history of his own able and skillful administration, and incidentally revealing the history of the moods and attitudes of Protestantism during the period which this administration covers. They are most instructive as giving one most important phase of the times for some thirty years. They are no less interesting and valuable as revealing the movements of a mind of great administrative and strategic power. Any Protestant clergyman can learn much from these volumes.

AGASSIZ' GEOLOGICAL SKETCHES.*—These papers were prepared from notes for extemporaneous lectures, and originally published in the "Atlantic Monthly." They are properly supplementary to the "Method of study in Natural History" which had a similar origin and history. The topics of which they treat are as follows: America and the Old World, The Silurian Beach, The

* *Geological Sketches.* By L. AGASSIZ. Boston: Ticknor & Fields, 1866. Small 12mo. pp. 311. New Haven: T. H. Pease. Price \$1.50.

Fern Forests of the Carboniferous Period, Mountains and their origin, The Growth of Continents, the Geological Middle Age, The Tertiary Age, and its characteristic Animals, The Formation of Glaciers, Internal structure and progression of Glaciers, External appearance of Glaciers. These topics are all of the highest interest, both to the scientific student and to the general reader, and they are treated by their author with his characteristic power and interest. His power of lucid and fascinating exposition approaches to genius. He invests common facts and wornout principles with a new charm and takes us step by step most easily up to the comprehension of the broadest and most inaccessible generalizations. We find ourselves at home, we scarcely know by what secret method of initiation, among the results of modern Geology and Paleontology. Prof. Agassiz is peculiar, we had almost said singular, in another particular. The study of nature is under his direction a study of the thoughts of the Creator. The investigation of the Geologic periods and the Geologic progress is a review of the original plan and anticipations of the intelligent author of the universe and of the conditions of its History. These views of his are presented, though not obtruded, on almost every page of this volume. Hence the value and interest of the work for the student of Natural Theology, and its great usefulness to counteract the both subtle and arrogant advocates of the doctrine of development or emanation, who are so numerous and influential among living physicists.

THE SOUTH SINCE THE WAR.*—These letters were written in the months of September, October, and November, 1865, in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, chiefly for the Boston Advertiser and the Chicago Tribune. They are now with some additional matter published in a volume. They are written by a sharp observer and an apparently candid and honest judge. They are of great interest and value at the present time, and hereafter will be esteemed of priceless worth by all who wish to know what was the state of feeling and opinion at the South very soon after the war came to an end.

* *The South since the War*: as shown by fourteen weeks of travel and observation in Georgia and the Carolinas. By SIDNEY ANDREWS. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 18mo. pp. 400.

THE QUEEN MOTHER AND ROSAMOND.*—Mr. Swinburne has recently come into knowledge and favor as the writer of the dramatic poems which are named upon the title-page of this volume. It is not easy in a few words to do justice to either his excellencies or his defects. That he possesses no little poetic power it were easy to see and to say; power both to imagine and to express. But we cannot say that he turns them to the best uses, nor that he achieves the best results. His subjects are too uniform and his treatment of them is far too monotonous. His verse is too elaborate, his sentiments are overwrought, even to conceits, and the one theme on which he lingers and to which he returns with ever excited zest is voluptuous and sensual love. That this is represented and defended by its votaries in a drama might of itself be no ground for objection, but that it should absorb the chief interest of the writer and be the theme, of all others, which kindles his imagination or evokes his power to describe, does not speak well for his culture, his taste, or his morals, especially if it be considered that the counter sentiments and actions, which ought to be called forth, are so coldly represented, and do not seem to be prompted by either the earnest convictions or the better feelings of the author.

ESPERANCE.†—The author's object in this story is very apparent. It is to describe the development of a genuine religious experience under the influence of God's great educator, sorrow. In the opening chapter we are introduced to Esperance (Hope), at her home in the vicinity of New York City. She is a proud, quick tempered, wayward girl. Her mother dies while she is yet a little child. Her father's ill treatment of her intensifies her proud reserve, and creates a morbid melancholy, bordering on misanthropy. Sent from home in disgrace for an attempt to warn her father against the intrigues of a dissolute and unprincipled step-mother, her morbid fancies are greatly increased by feeding in her boarding school on such food as the pages of Byron and Shelley afford. A companion and congenial spirit lends her Paine's *Age of Reason*, and under the combined influence of the book and the living

* *The Queen Mother and Rosamond.* By ALGERNON CHARLES SWINBURNE, author of "*Atalanta in Calydon*," and "*Chastelard*." Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. New Haven: T. H. Pease. Price \$1.50

† *Esperance.* By META LANDER, author of "*Light on the Dark River*," "*Marion Graham*," etc. Sheldon and Co., New York.

voice she embraces infidelity, though with a school girl's embrace, timid and shy, and with but little real knowledge of the character of her new love. A revival of religion commences in the school. Under the influence of a hard, dogmatical, and fatalistic theology, against which her whole nature revolts, *Esperance* is transformed at first from a secret infidel to an open and avowed enemy of religion. "I hate God," is her bitter exclamation. But her very audacity alarms her. The remembrance of her pious mother's prayers, and the strong influence of the wide-spread religious feeling among her companions, beget a struggle with her pride and her morbid passion, from the wretchedness of which she is only relieved by a submission to the claims of a God, whom she still mistakenly regards as a despotic king rather than as a loving Father. She yields to law, not to love. She is a servant, not a child. In her new bondage to the claims of conscience she finds at first little comfort. In the service which she attempts she achieves little success.

But under the guidance of a good Providence, and in the school of sorrow, she is eventually brought, though not without many struggles, out of her bondage into the liberty of the children of God, and a life of love, and joy, and peace, and hope in Christ. Two-thirds of the book are devoted to this story of her gradual emancipation.

The office of the true critic is not to pick at words and phrases, but, comprehending the object of the author, to determine whether the object has been well and truly accomplished. In this case we have simply to ask—is this a true story of religious experience? Is this the way, or one of the ways, in which souls grow into the kingdom of God. The question whether the pet names are in good taste, and the few French phrases introduced are well selected, is nothing to the purpose. Neither are we to ask whether the incidents here recorded are of common occurrence. We trust not. Though the recent developments in our courts attest the fact that they are not impossible. But it is not the object of the author to give a true picture of American life, but to depict the development of a religious experience under the influence of peculiar sorrows, and for this purpose she has carried her heroine through sorrows that are peculiar, as she had a novelist's right to do.

The secret history of a soul is here written, and well written. The authoress, the wife of a gentleman well known as equally successful in the pastorate and the theological professor's chair, and

herself favorably known to the public by her pen, has had peculiar facilities for acquiring an acquaintance both with the mental philosophy of the schools, and the actual experiences of life; and the fidelity of her analysis and experience shows that she has well improved her opportunities.

THE RESTORATION.*—This treatise is written to support the doctrines of millenarianism, and is brief, pointed, and earnest. It contains the usual arguments and interpretations, but nothing more. It is written in the best spirit and with fervent love of the truth and of Christ. To those who feel interested in propagating these interpretations of prophecy, it may be recommended as a very acceptable and able treatise of its kind.

REBELLION RECORD.—Fifty-eight numbers of this valuable documentary history of the Slaveholders' Rebellion are now published. The last number (lviii.) contains the rebel official reports of the operations of their armies around Richmond in the summer of 1862. [D. Van Nostrand, publisher, No. 192 Broadway, New York. Agent in New Haven, T. H. Pease. Price 60 cents per number.]

REPUBLICATION OF THE BRITISH REVIEWS BY THE LEONARD SCOTT PUBLISHING COMPANY.—The publication business heretofore carried on by L. Scott & Co., will be continued hereafter under the name of "*The Leonard Scott Publishing Company.*" No other change is at present contemplated, beyond that of mere form from a Copartnership to a Corporation. [T. H. Pease agent in New Haven.]

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

A Discourse delivered January 31, 1866, at the funeral of the Rev. Samuel W. S. Dutton, D. D., Pastor of the North Church in New Haven. By Leonard Bacon. 1866. 8vo. pp. 32. With a portrait. For sale in New Haven by F. T. Jarman. Price, 25 cents. For which sum it will be mailed on receipt of the money.

Memorial of Elisha Lord Cleaveland, New Haven. 1866. 8vo. pp. 70. T. H. Pease, publisher, New Haven. Price, 50 cents. For which sum it will be mailed on receipt of the money.

* *The Restoration*: or the hope of the early Church realized. By Rev. HENRY RILEY, late Pastor of the First Presbyterian church, Montrose, Pa. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 1866. 24mo. pp. 288.

Sermons preached on different occasions during the last twenty years. By the Rev. Edward Meyrick Goulburn, D. D., Prebendary of St Paul's, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains in Ordinary. Reprinted from the second London edition. Two volumes in one. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 391.

The Holy Comforter; His Presence and His Work. By J. P. Thompson, D. D. Sq. 16mo. pp. 210. New York: A. D. F. Randolph.

Christian Unity and its Recovery. 12mo. pp. 119. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

The Restoration; or the Hope of the Early Church Realized. By Henry A. Riley. With an Introduction by Rev. J. A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. 16mo. pp. 288. (Price, \$1.25. Upon receipt of which it will be sent by mail, prepaid.)

Discourse on Human Depravity. By S. S. Schmucker, D. D. Gettysburg. 1865. 8vo. pp. 15.

History of Congregationalism from about A. D. 250 to the Present Time, in Continuation of the Account of the Origin and Earliest History of this System of Church Polity, contained in "A View of Congregationalism." By George Punchard. Second edition. Rewritten and greatly enlarged. Two volumes. 12mo. pp. vii., 562; xiii., 519. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1865.

The Prominent Characteristics of the Congregational Churches. A Lecture. By George Moor. San Francisco. 1866. 16mo. pp. 60.

The Theater. A Sermon delivered in the First Presbyterian Church, Dayton, Ohio. By T. E. Thomas, D. D. With the subsequent discussion between T. E. Thomas, D. D. and I. A. McMahon, Esq. 16mo. pp. 56.

The Cross in the Cell. Conversations with a prisoner while awaiting his execution. By a Minister of the Gospel. American Tract Society. Boston. 16mo. pp. vi., 236.

The Living Forces of the Universe. The Temple and the Worshipers. Know and Govern Thyself. By George W. Thompson. Philadelphia: Howard Challen. 1866. 12mo. pp. 358.

The Threatening Ruin; A Discourse for the Times. By Joseph A. Seiss, D. D. Philadelphia. 1866. Smith, English & Co. 16mo. pp. 89.

A Discourse pronounced at the dedication of the Union Chapel in Santiago, January 7, 1866. By the Rev. David Trumbull. Valparaiso. 1866. 8vo. pp. 19.

Short Sermons to Newsboys. With a history of the formation of the Newsboys' Lodging House. Illustrations. 16mo. pp. vi., 244. New York: C. Scribner & Co.

Earnest Christian's Library. Volume I. Plain Words on Christian Living. By Charles John Vaughan, D. D. 16mo. pp. 221. The Cross of Jesus; or Heaven on Earth to Me. By the Rev. David Thompson. 16mo. pp. 164. Sure Words of Promise. 16mo. pp. 499. The Soul Gatherer. By the Author of "The Way Home." 16mo. pp. 215. New York: Carlton & Porter.

The Elements of Moral Science. By Francis Wayland, D. D., L.L.D.; late President of Brown University, and Professor of Moral Philosophy. Revised and improved edition. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. (This popular treatise is issued with the last improvements given it by its lamented author. The bulk of the volume is not enlarged, but several chapters have been rewritten.)

Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church: Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. 8vo. pp. xxx, 656. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.

A History of New England, from the Discovery by Europeans to the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century, being an abridgment of his "History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty." By John Gorham Palfrey. In two volumes. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 12mo. pp. xx, 408. xii, 426.

Lectures on the Study of History, delivered in Oxford, 1859-1861. By Goldwin Smith, Regius Professor of Modern History. To which is added a Lecture delivered before the New York Historical Society, in December, 1864, on the University of Oxford. 12mo. pp. 269. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for 1865. By Charles Merivale, B. D. 12mo. pp. 281. New York. 1866. D. Appleton & Co.

Notes on the History of Slavery in Massachusetts. By George H. Moore. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 256.

The Story of the Embarkation of Cromwell and his Friends for New England. Boston. 8vo. pp. 11.

The Life of John Brainerd, the brother of David Brainerd and his successor as Missionary to the Indians of New Jersey. By Rev. Thomas Brainerd, D. D. 12mo. pp. 492. Philadelphia: Presbyterian Board of Publication.

Life of Emanuel Swedenborg, together with a brief synopsis of his writings, both philosophical and theological. By William White. With an introduction by B. T. Barrett. 12mo. pp. 272. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

Temperance Recollections, Labors, Defeats, Triumphs; An Autobiography. By John Marsh, D. D. New York. 1866. Charles Scribner & Co. 16mo. pp. 378.

Four Years of Fighting: A Volume of Personal Observations with the Army and Navy, from the first battle of Bull Run to the Fall of Richmond. By C. C. Coffin. 8vo. pp. xvii, 558. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

Life and Times of Andrew Johnson, Seventeenth President of the United States. Written from a national stand point By a National Man. New York. 1866. D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 363.

BELLES LETTRES.

The Lost Tales of Miletus. By Sir E. B. Lytton. 16mo. pp. 182. New York: Harper & Brothers.

The Maiden and Married Life of Mary Powell, afterwards Mistress Milton. New York: M. W. Dodd. 16 mo. pp. 271.

Poems. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," Etc. Miss Dinah M. Mulock. 16mo. pp. xi, 260. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. "Blue and Gold."

A Noble Life. By the Author of "John Halifax, Gentleman." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 302.

The Dove in the Eagle's Nest. By Miss Yonge. 12mo. pp. 339. New York: D. Appleton & Co.

Asphodel. Boston. 1866. Ticknor & Fields. 16mo. pp. 224.

Shakespeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility, and Suicide. By A. O.

Kellogg, M. D., Assistant Physician State Lunatic Asylum, Utica, N. Y. New York. Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 16mo. pp. 204.

Summer Rest. By Gail Hamilton. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 16mo. pp. 356.

A Plea for the Queen's English. Stray Notes on Speaking and Spelling. By Henry Alford, D. D., Dean of Canterbury. 16mo. pp. xvi., 287. New York: A. Strahan.

MISCELLANEOUS.

On Wakefulness. With an Introductory Chapter on the Physiology of Sleep. By William A. Hammond M. D. 12mo. pp. 98. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Price, \$1.

Obscure Diseases of the Brain and Mind. By Forbes Winslow, M. D. Second American, from the Third and Revised English edition. 8vo. pp. 483. Philadelphia: H. C. Lea. Price, \$4.25.

Principles of Education, Drawn from Nature and Revelation, and Applied to Female Education in the Upper Classes. By the Author of "Amy Herbert," and other tales. Two volumes in one. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 12mo. pp. 476.

Spiritualism Identical with Ancient Sorcery, New Testament Demonology and Modern Witchcraft; with the testimony of God and man against it. By W. M'Donald. New York: Carlton & Porter. 16mo. pp. 212.

The Ethics of the Dust. Ten Lectures to Little Housewives on the Elements of Crystallization. By John Ruskin. 12mo. pp. 260. New York: John Wiley & Son. Price, \$1.25.

The Crown of Wild Olives. Three Lectures on Work, Traffic, and War. By John Ruskin. 13mo. pp. xxi., 127. New York: J. Wiley & Son.

Mr. Dunn Browne's Experiences in the Army. By Samuel Fiske, Captain Fourteenth Connecticut Volunteers. 12mo. pp. 890. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. Price, \$2.

Addresses and Proceedings, including the Oration pronounced by the Rev. Dr. Bushnell, at the Commencement Celebration, held July 26th, 1865, in honor of the Alumni of Yale College, who were in the Military and Naval Service of the United States, during the recent war: together with the names comprised in the Roll of Honor. 1866. 8vo. pp. 105.

The Science of Government, in Connection with American Institutions. By Joseph Alden D. D., LL. D. 12mo. pp. 248. New York: Sheldon & Co.

Addresses and Discourse at the Inauguration of the Rev. George F. Magoun, A. M., as President of Iowa College, July 19, 1865. 8vo. pp. 60.

Patriotic Eloquence; being Selections from One Hundred Years of National Literature. Compiled for the Use of Schools in Reading and Speaking. By Mrs. C. M. Kirkland. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 324.

Poor Matt; or the Clouded Intellect. By Jean Ingelow. 16mo. pp. 125. Boston: Roberts Brothers.

The Great West: Railroad, Steamboat, and Stage Guide, and Handbook for Travelers, Miners, and Emigrants to the Western, Northwestern and Pacific States and Territories. With a Map of the best routes to the Gold and Silver. By Edward H. Hall. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 24mo. pp. 181.

Indian Corn; its Value, Culture and Uses. By Edward Enfield. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 16mo. pp. 308.

Sun Rays; Fair and Cloudy Skies. By Cousin Carrie, Author of "Keep a Good Heart." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 16mo. pp. 270.

The Young Lady of Pleasure. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. 12mo. pp. 316.

Precious Truths in Plain Words. Boston: American Tract Society. 16mo.

A Brief Treatise upon Constitutional and Party Questions, and the History of Parties as I received it orally from the late Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois. By J. Madison Cutts, Brevet Lieutenant Colonel, U. S. A. New York: 1866. D. Appleton & Co. 8vo. pp. 221.

Medical Recollections of the Army of the Potomac. By Jonathan Letterman, M. D., late Surgeon United States Army and Medical Director of the Army of the Potomac. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 194.

Brevity and Brilliancy in Chess. A collection of Games at this "Royal Pastime," ingeniously contested and ending with scientific problems culled from the whole range of chess literature. By Miron J. Hazeltine, Esq. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 249.

Medical Electricity; Embracing Electro-Physiology and Electricity as a Therapeutic; with special reference to Practical Medicine; showing the most approved apparatus, methods, and rules for the medical uses of Electricity in the Treatment of Nervous Diseases. By Alfred C. Garrett, M. D. Third edition. Revised and Illustrated. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 1108.

Publications of the American Tract Society, 150 Nassau Street., New York.—While They Are With Us. 24mo. pp. 144.—Green Pastimes for Christ's "Little Ones." 24mo. pp. 182.—Basil; or Honesty and Industry. 24mo. pp. 128.—Bertha Allston; or the Good Stepmother. 24mo. pp. 84.—Wee Davie. By Norman Macleod, D. D. 24mo. pp. 86.—Leaves of Life; Striking Facts and Poetry, Illustrating Select Passages from God's Word. 24mo.—Lyntonville; or the Irish Boy in Canada. 16mo. pp. 188.

Publications of the American Tract Society, Boston.—Enoch Roden's Training. By the Author of "Fern's Hollow." 24mo. pp. 288.—Precious Truths in Plain Words. 24mo.—The Freedman's Third Reader. 12mo. pp. 264.—The History of a Lost Purse; or, Jessie and Her Friends. 24mo. pp. 192.

T H E
N E W E N G L A N D E R.

No. XCVII.

O C T O B E R, 1866.

ARTICLE I.—THE RELATIONS OF ART TO EDUCATION.

THE elegant and costly building designed for the use of the Yale School of Art is now completed. Its founder, Mr. Street, of New Haven, chose to bear unassisted, the burden of its erection; and in so doing has built for himself a name for large-hearted liberality. Few men could have given so much for an object of pure benevolence; fewer still would have had the breadth of mind to do so much for an educational object, and especially for a department of education so imperfectly understood and appreciated as that of Art.

Mr. Street was not permitted to live to see the completion of this beautiful edifice, so that it has now become his monument—a most fitting monument of his mind and character. Nothing that is low, or false, or unsightly, should enter its doors. All things that are true, that are pure, that are lovely, that are of good report, and only such as these, should be found within it. Mr. Street possessed the means and the opportunity of cultivating his mind to an uncommon degree. He did this for his children's sake as well as for his own. He was the indefatigable superintendent of his children's education, and their personal friend and guide in all that is worthy and beautiful, and was thus made to be the instrument of guiding

and educating others. A fine classical scholar, a man of extensive and accurate reading in English literature, and of exquisite taste in all matters pertaining to art; he was also a man of decided will, and of quiet but independent opinions. Kept from the active pursuits of business life by long-continued ill health, his mind assumed a more thoughtful and meditative cast, in which fruitful soil ideas respecting the meaning and limits of a true education sprang up. He deeply felt the want in our systems of education of the practical element, of something which might unite educated men with the present time and the present world in which they live. No one more thoroughly appreciated the need of classical and scientific studies, as forming the foundation of education; but he thought that there were men who lived now as well as in the days of Greece and Rome—men who spoke their own living languages, and wrought their own living works, which were well worth knowing and studying. He endowed a professorship of modern languages in Yale College; and instead of spending his fortune in erecting a costly palace for himself, he built a "Palace of Art," free to all who would enter with earnest mind to learn more of the beauty of truth. It was well said by one of the speakers at the last meeting of the alumni of Yale, "that this art-building might, indeed, in the course of time crumble and decay, but it would have then reproduced itself; and still live on in far more beautiful structures, and above all in its silent influence in building up the imperishable fabric of a finished, ennobled, and educated mind."

We would add to this brief notice of the character of Mr. Street, that a sincere and humble Christian faith sustained him through the labors and trials of an age lengthened out amid great suffering and bodily infirmity to seventy-four years, and sheds a cheering, mild, and blessed light upon his memory.

The building, whose cost is estimated to approach the sum of two hundred thousand dollars, may be described as composed of two principal parts or wings, one forty-six by eighty-six feet, the other thirty-one by seventy-seven feet, connected by another part containing the entries and chief staircases. This arrangement gives quite an irregular surface of wall, thus lending light and shade and picturesque effect. The building is

plain and solid, with points, however, of judicious ornamentation. Its principal material is the New Jersey sandstone, relieved by darker Connecticut sandstone for the architectural lines and courses. The corridors are pointed Gothic, which, with the hipped roof and the turrets at the angles, characterize the structure as a Gothic building with special adaptation to a modern use. Thus the roof is half of slate and half of glass, and there are other novel and original features; indeed, for a successful and beautiful adaptation of the Gothic to the purposes of a modern art-building the architect deserves great praise. The basement, which is twelve feet high, has rooms well lighted and fitted for lecturing and modeling. The first story is devoted to studios, library room, and official apartments. The second and highest story contains two galleries for the exhibition of pictures and works of art, the larger one seventy six by thirty, the smaller sixty-eight by twenty-two. While the principal entrance is upon the town side, the finest aspect of the building is upon the College grounds; and, when the architectural plans in respect to the College grounds and the other new buildings to be erected are carried out, the effect will be attractive and noble. The inauguration of this building for the purpose of instruction in art in Yale College brings up naturally the general subject of the relations of art to education. Perhaps something may be said to place this subject in a clearer light than it seems to be at present in the minds of some, even intelligent men.

True education, we hold, aims to produce a harmonious development of the nature, neglecting nothing essential, and cultivating nothing disproportionately, to the total exclusion of other things. One may be educated to a certain extent and in a certain direction, and be far from being a man of true culture; whole regions of his nature may still lie barren and waste, unresponsive to the design of their Creator. A good mathematician is not a thoroughly educated man, nor is a good philologist. The culture of the pure intellect is not the sole object of education. Even physical culture is not to be overlooked. We cannot tell how great an influence a manly physical training exerts upon character. The Christian world seems to be just now beginning to see what the Greeks per-

ceived ages ago, that physical culture has a moral value, that the healthy perfection of the body has its influence upon the soundness and beauty of the spirit which it contains. The apostle's admonition "For bodily exercise profiteth little" refers to those ascetic tendencies and bodily mortifications which were introduced by gnostic teachers in the place of true godliness and a Christian life. And yet we would not make too much of physical culture, nor believe that the renovation of humanity will spring from it. We would not seek to change the relative value of things. The training of the moral and religious nature, of the conscience and will, of those faculties which have an immediate relation to God and the profoundest principles of character,—this undoubtedly lies at the foundation of any true idea of education. It may be also taken for granted that the discipline of the intellect, of the knowing and reasoning powers, comes next in point of importance, and indeed occupies that middle place which makes education to mean nothing, unless it means the right development and orderly exercise of the distinctively intellectual faculties. But this is not all. There is still left an important portion of the being whose place is harder to define, belonging partly to the rational and partly to the affectional nature; it is the region more peculiarly of the imagination and sentiments, in which lie the springs of feeling for the true, the beautiful, and the good. How broad a region is this. How narrow the view which would suffer this to run to waste, which would allow this vital portion of our human nature, that which makes it genuinely human, to be forgotten. The imagination is one of the noblest of the faculties. It is the creative power of the mind assimilating us to God. It is that which makes all things new. How grand a quality in an orator! It is that which gives one man's sermon a freshness and vital power, which another preacher's sermon of equal force of thought does not have. The greatest preachers, like Chrysostom, Augustine, Luther, Robert Hall, and Chalmers, have all had this quality in a high degree, not only lighting up their words and thoughts with marvelous brilliancy, but enabling them to cast original and penetrating glances into the illimitable fields of divine truth. Should this noble quality of the mind be left out of the account in any

comprehensive idea of education or life? The Germans say that "the true art is to live beautifully;" if so we can ill afford to neglect the cultivation of the more purely imaginative and æsthetical part of the nature, or of that true art, which presents to us so many hints of a beautiful life, and which gives harmony, glory, and finish to the whole.

Art has been heretofore in a great degree excluded from our system of education from the fear that, in the future as in the past, it may lead to a refined but degenerate civilization. This was the case in Greece and Modern Italy, and history has frequently repeated the lesson. The intelligent Puritan mind had read this lesson, and repudiated the art which enfeebles while it refines; and with all our love of art we had rather stand in the judgment of history and of God with the stern Puritan, than with the accomplished foe with whom he fought. He occupies an incomparably higher place in history and in the history of mind. He is the true American who does not give up one iota of his Puritanism, but who engrafts upon the strong and sturdy stock of Puritanism a richer and more generous culture. But in every instance where art has aided in degrading a people, it can be proved, we contend, that other deeper moral causes were at work; and that the art in question was in no case that of the true type, but was connected with some corrupt philosophy, or fatal error of Christian doctrine, or grossly perverted public sentiment. It was moreover as a general thing an incomplete conception of art itself, formed chiefly upon the sensuous idea; it was not that true art which combines the sensuous with the higher rational and ideal qualities of the mind, which is built on ideas and has a deep moral element in it.

1. The study of true Art, or æsthetic culture, should be introduced into education because art comprises so great a portion of the life of mind. It is as genuine a department of the mental nature as logic or mathematics. Who will deny that it took as much mind to build St. Peter's cathedral, or to compose the music of Sebastian Bach, as to write the "*Mechanique Celeste*?" In treating of the artistic mind we are not confined to architects, or musicians, or sculptors, but we must reckon in the poets. Homer, Euripides, Dante, Shakes-

peare, Milton, creating fresh worlds of the imagination, bodying forth new forms of beauty, truth, and power, were as true artists as Michael Angelo and Beethoven. The artistic mind is seen in literature. It is mind moving in the region of ideas, and from the pure impulse of delight in beauty and truth, creating ideal works that reflect the nobler inward emotions, hopes, and conceptions of the mind. Could any one be called a truly educated man who had never studied Shakespeare, and who knew nothing and felt nothing of the new world of thought, action, beauty, feeling, and power, which his works reveal? No more, in truth, than a man could be called a Biblical scholar who had never read the poetical parts of the Bible, the psalms, and the prophecies.

The knowledge needed by a true artist,—for example, by a good painter,—proves to us at a glance that no ordinary amount of intellectual preparation and ability is demanded. He is required to make himself master of anatomy, of optics and light and shade perspective, of geology and botany, of chemistry and the science of colors, of the principles of gravity, harmony, expression, and the deeper laws of the mind. Added to these a wide reading of history, and general literature, and a cultivation of the mind, so that it can grasp the formative ideas or spirit of an age, or of an heroic character, or of a grand and beautiful scene of nature. A great painter is a great poet. The colors he uses are his language, and his pictures are his poems, instinct with thought and glowing with the light of mind. A work of art is not only the product of strong feeling but of pure intelligence.

2. True æsthetic culture would introduce into our system of education a new spirit of freedom. The highest idea of life even in the Christian sense is the union of law with liberty, the obedience of duty because one sees the beauty of truth and delights in it from the heart. It is the province of education to bring out this real beauty of truth so that it shall meet the best desires and susceptibilities of the mind, and shall be followed freely by the truth-seeker. As a people we have freedom much on our tongues but not so much in our spirits. We have brought down everything to the dead level of the actual. It is the thing which is, which answers the present purpose,

which meets the present emergency, which constitutes the present success, which is visible and palpable, and not the thing which should be, which aims at the possible truth and the noble ideal. *Æsthetic* culture would flow into our educational systems as an ennobling influence, freeing us from our utilitarian spirit and elevating the national mind. Our practical character is our strength, and it is the glory and strength of our American system of education as contradistinguished from much that we find in the highly theoretical European systems. But while we would not disparage or weaken this strong practical American quality, we would counteract its tendencies towards an ignoble and materialistic conception of life. Art would come in to aid in this contest against the money-making and money-worshipping spirit. It would tend to free us from this gross bondage of materialism. It would inspire us to follow truth because of truth's own superior attractions, because of the real delight which the sight of the intrinsic loveliness of truth inspires. It would raise us into the higher world of ideas, and give true freedom and play to the spirit. We are an intensely earnest and practical people, why should we not also become a free and happy people?

3. A genuine *æsthetic* culture avoiding the corrupt tendencies of Art, would bring into education an ethical element and influence of no mean power of value. Art is not often regarded as a moral power; but in man's complex nature everything which bears upon the formation of character assumes a moral importance. Our life is not altogether made up of moral acts, but also of more subtle antecedent conditions, affections, tastes, and sympathies. The will is moved by a thousand invisible cords of motive and imagination. These bear an important, though sometimes indefinable, part in the general working and moulding of character. Schiller says that "every man has a pure ideal man within himself;" and if so, it is the part of true education to recognize and arrive at this pure ideal of manhood. As Christians, we see in Christ, in his character, and in his divine humanity, the pure ideal of manhood, and through Christ received into the heart by faith, we see the true and the only way of reaching this ideal, and of perfecting our humanity. But may not Christianity itself em-

ploy—not to originate a new and higher life, but to assist in training and educating this higher life—the aid of those ennobling ideas which true Art brings; especially, since much of its own power lies on that very side of the nature, the imaginative side, that of the tastes and sentiments, which is the peculiar province of Art? Let Christianity then purify this portion of the nature; let it elevate these affections and susceptibilities into moral affections; let it purify Art itself, and use it in the great plan of a higher and more perfect Christian idea of education. It will not do for the taste and imagination of a man to be in direct opposition to his sense of religious duty. If so he must then sternly deny his taste and follow the path of duty; but he is incomparably a stronger man when taste and duty harmonize, and when he can give all his powers to the glad obedience of Truth. This portion of our nature claims to be recognized by Christianity, and to come beneath the folds of Christian charity and nurture. Savonarola centuries ago conceived this idea, but the idea seemed to have been almost extinguished with his life. He held that the imaginative faculties had a place in our being, and that external nature was the symbol of internal ideas, and was made for the education and joy of the mind. In education, he claimed “that youth should not receive a lesson of Paganism without receiving at the same time a lesson of Christianity, and that they should be equally instructed in eloquence and truth.” Dante, two centuries before, had wrought upon the same high conception of art as a moral and educational influence. From him the religious painters of his epoch, Simon Memmi, Cimabue, Giotto, Orcagna, drew their inspiration. The sculpture gallery of the “Purgatorio” stands as a monument of his belief in the power of art to assist in the purification and elevation of the struggling human mind; and why some of those noble subjects for sculpture with which he adorned the cornice of the mountain that led with rugged steps up to Paradise have never been put into marble, we know not.

We may see how art can aid morality and a Christian education in many practical ways. A man, for example, does not commit a mean, or dishonest, or indecent act, because it is an

offense against good taste. This, you say, is a very inadequate motive, but if the motive really *stops* the man from a wrong action, an outwardly wrong action, it is worth something, and it is not to be thrown entirely out of the account. The principle of Good Taste, or of fitness in all things, is not, it is true, the highest or strongest principle of action, but it may come in to aid, and to mould, and to restrain, together with deeper influences, and perhaps sometimes to take their place in cases where they do not operate. We know that many would continue to imitate the manneristic boorishness of some good men, thinking it perhaps to be an essential part of their goodness; but when shall we see a more general and thorough appreciation (having nothing in it of servility or effeminacy) of that

“Grand old name of gentleman.”

This is manliness ennobled and gentled. It is a combination of strength and mildness. It does not consist in the supple knee nor the diddling and fawning manner, but in the refined mind, the kind, brave, and courteous heart, the absence of all pretension and snobbery. It is the noble tact of a heart that instinctively discerns the beauty and fitness of things, and that scorns what is base and low. It is “John Halifax, gentleman.” Let a young man’s taste be so cultivated that he sees that everything bad is deformed, and everything good is beautiful, and it must be confessed that he is not far from the kingdom of Heaven. True æsthetic culture develops those feelings and those tendencies of mind that are thus favorable to virtue, and good manners, and even a higher faith. Education should give this impulse, this direction to the minds of the young, that they may see the beauty of virtue, and recognize the nobleness of truth, and follow after goodness from a love of its own intrinsic loveliness. Evil thus loses its false attractions. Its power is disenchanted by the spell of a mightier. True beauty will be mightier than false beauty. Satan will cower and shrink and reveal his falsehood at the touch of the celestial spear of true goodness. The young will be attracted by some kind of beauty, and will love and follow if not the true, then the false. And here let us speak of the decidedly corrupting influence of some works of art. Much evil flows from

them. The indiscriminate visitation of the great galleries of Europe by our young people of both sexes, traveling abroad without educational or hardly moral supervision, has doubtless done great injury. Some works of European art that have gone through this country, originating from a corrupt mind and a debased French taste, have been the more pestilential because they possessed a certain kind of artistic beauty. But we nevertheless hold that these have been false works of art; that the best art, springing from a pure source, and built upon true artistic ideas, is never immoral in its tendency. A poor lithographic painting of a corrupt nature exposed in a shop window, will do more harm to good morals, than the most beautiful work of art that has in its fearless truth copied the innocence of nature. But we think that here, even in regard to true art, since humanity has so much innate corruption, art must be held under severe restraint and censorship, must not rely too much upon transcendental ideas of the innocence of nature, and should avoid even the appearance of evil, and above all when employed for educational purposes. But how shall we meet these corrupting influences of false art? Shall we, in the spirit of the Caliph Omar, destroy all the works of art in the world, and declare that there shall be no more art so long as the world stands; or shall we meet false art with true art—shall we head off the evil with the good—shall we instill right principles of art that shall overpower and defeat depraved principles? It is an unmanly argument that we should give up what is good because it has been, or may be, wrested to a false use. Poetry has been made the instrument of immense evil; shall we have no more poetry? Oratory has been turned into a powerful agent of wrong by the accomplished demagogue, and the fiery partisan of oppression, and shall the voice of true eloquence be for this reason hushed? Shall the holy strains of sacred music cease because evil passion has breathed through music to light unhallowed fires? The blessed and perfect One did not pray that his disciples should be taken out of the world, but that they should be kept from evil.

4. The study of art affords a counterpoise to certain narrowing and injurious tendencies in the common forms of education itself, by presenting truth in a more natural and concrete form.

The first thing, doubtless, in a practical education is hard study,—the thorough discipline of the mental powers. This makes the mind accurate. It sharpens its powers. It teaches it how to think. It is the purely scientific process, whether employed in the study of mathematics, or the languages, or any other branch of education. This, undoubtedly, comes first. The mind must learn to analyze, to separate, to reflect, to arrive at facts by the severe and narrow path of logical induction. Science comes before art in education, as it does in life. There is first truth, then beauty. There is first utility, then art. Art itself is in no slight degree built upon science, and one important department of art is the scientific analysis of nature. But the scientific process, every thoughtful mind will acknowledge, has its evils and its perpetual evil tendencies. Dealing almost entirely with analysis, it inclines to overlook and sometimes to lose the beautiful synthesis and wholeness of truth. It fails often with all its patient labors to come to the unity of knowledge, and the clear light and perfection of truth; and thus science has confessedly its perilous side. It is often in a striking degree partial and incomplete. It sometimes leaves the mind totally in the dark. Employing almost exclusively the logical and reasoning faculties, it leaves out of account the freer intuitions of the mind and the illuminating power of the imagination. Art makes use of these, and frequently through its clear and rapid intuitions it comes at the wholeness of truth, where science sees but in part darkly. Art aims at unity. It looks to the beautiful whole. It is nothing if it do not arrive at distinct results, at well-rounded and perfect forms of truth. It cannot stop half way. It cannot abide in partial or confused ideas, and it strives always for the highest ideal perfection. While it has much then to do, even as science has, with the sensible and the material, it does not so much incline to materialistic conceptions of truth as science does, but is seeking for higher things, is ever climbing toward the region of ideas, is ever striving to escape from the sensuous, and the earthy, to the ideal and spiritual. While, therefore, art can and should never take the place of science, nor is it at all of such primary importance in education, yet art may come in to correct and modify whatever evil and sceptical tendencies there may be in

the one-sided processes of science. It comes in to show to the learner the glorious truths of nature in their entirety and living forms. True art does not lead to scepticism, but rather to reverence and truth. It finds beauty and goodness in all the works of God, even in the least of his works, in the stone and the weed as well as the mountain and the sky; in the sentiment of the heart, as well as the thought of the brain and labor of the hand.

5. The study of art leads to the more careful cultivation of the perceptive powers of the mind. These should not be neglected in a true system of education, any more than the training of the reflective faculties. Perception is indeed the fundamental law or method of art. It is a great thing to teach the young to observe accurately, to observe nature, not merely to see, but to perceive, the objects of nature,—to see them with the inner eye of the mind. Art is formed on nature. Close study of nature is the solid foundation of an artistic education. The artist must learn the structure of the earth, the structural character of rocks, the laws of light and color, the principles which govern the botanical and vegetable world, in fine, the laws of the natural world. Art leads the mind from the study of books which are the works and ideas of men, into the free unbounded fields of nature—into the study of God's ideas. This is always a healthy and liberalizing process. It affords mental exercise and discipline of most pleasing kind. It introduces variety and freshness into a course of education. It lets God's sunlight and air into the study. Young men would not come out of college book-worms or mere scholars, but men of healthful, fresh, and independent minds, with the eye open to see the beauty and glory of the universe lying about them.

6. Art in education assists in the study of other branches of knowledge, especially in the formation of a good style of writing and speaking. The arts are one. The principles of the art of sculpture are also the principles of the art of style. Form is the great aim in art, and so it is in oratory. Beauty of investiture lends force to truth. Good taste in speaking gives untold efficiency to the spoken word. The laws of thought and expression in the manifestation of truth, flowing from an inner

law, are the same in the writer as in the artist strictly speaking,—the same elements of vital unity, fitness, proportion, and the like. All kinds of culture tend powerfully, though it may be insensibly to the forming of a clear, vigorous and elegant style of writing, without false ornament or false strength. In classical or historical studies art likewise lends practical assistance. The careful study of the Colosseum forms a chapter in Roman history just as important as a book of Livy or Tacitus. Some one has said that it would be a good plan to hang up in every Latin school in the land a correct representation of Julius Cæsar marching into Gaul at the head of the 10th Legion; for many boys, doubtless, imagine Cæsar, in his looks and costume, to be not unlike General Scott or General Grant. Our classical school books and dictionaries are taking advantage of art in their illustrations of ancient architecture, coins, costume, and manners and customs. The history of the human mind is written in art. In no department of knowledge are stamped more wonderfully the features of a changing and progressive civilization, of the great progressive steps of history. The spirit of an age is caught and rendered with fidelity in the buildings, sculptures, pictures, poetry, and æsthetic literature of that age. The subtle life of humanity has expressed itself in art more faithfully and exquisitely than in any other way, for the great artist is the true expression of the feeling and thought of his age. Prince Albert said in his address at the opening of the Crystal Palace: "The fine arts have so important an influence on the development of mind and the feeling of the people, and are so generally taken as the type of the degree and character of that development, that it is in the fragments and works of art come down to us from bygone nations that we are wont to form an estimate of the state of their civilization, manners, customs, and religion."

Art aids yet again in the pursuits of natural philosophy and the industrial sciences. Accuracy of eye, good taste in form, color, proportion, comparison, actual skill in drawing—these further in a hundred ways the studies of the astronomer, the geographer, the mechanician, and the civil engineer. We once heard a distinguished geologist lament that he had neglected the art of drawing when young, so that in his travels and re-

searches into nature he was much hampered by not being able to sketch rapidly the broad physical conformation of new lands, and the more minute details of rock and vegetable phenomena. How often, too, in common life, the skill of the ready draughtsman is called in requisition, from the planning of a house and the laying out of public grounds and cemeteries, to the sketching of a simple article of furniture, of a passing scene of travel, or of a rare tree, plant, or leaf, met in the daily walk.

7. Art in education has an interesting social bearing, and exerts a powerful and genial influence on the common intercourse and life of a community. It draws out kindly feelings, and softens natural harshness of temper. It rebukes the tendency to indulge in small rivalries, by affording a broad theme of conversation and of rational enjoyment, in which there is little opportunity for petty controversy, or where all can enjoy a feast of good things prepared by him who made all things good and beautiful in their time. Art being sincerely human, and altogether universal in its aim, tends to unite the sympathies of man, and to awaken interest for everything human. Those very things in man that philosophy and even morality are sometimes inclined to pass by and despise, Art kindly takes up and cherishes—like trampled flowers. It would be an improvement when Art could enter somewhat more into the common conversation and intercourse of young men. It might take the place of other things, not, perhaps, so improving. Music and singing are already doing good in this direction, tending to promote kind feeling, and to increase the rational happiness of social life among the young men of our American colleges as in those of the old world. It is surely better for students to sing in companies, making the streets echo with the well-sustained and ringing chorus, than to make night hideous as formerly with calithumpean bands and brutal yells.

When we come to speak of the actual introduction of Art into our present system of education, or of the establishment and working of a School of Art in a University, there is more difficulty, because it is comparatively a new field. Although separate schools of art exist, such as the Royal Academy of London, the Ecole des Beaux Arts of Paris, the Munich School of

Art, and the Schools of Design in New York, Philadelphia and Chicago, yet we believe the School of Art about to be established in connection with Yale College, is the first of the kind directly connected with a university place of education in the world. There is some movement to institute a similar school in Oxford, but we do not learn that it has been as yet carried out. There are new questions to be met. How far shall the study of Art enter into a regular academic course? How can it find a place without displacing more important studies? Should it constitute a purely professional school, by itself, rather than an academical course of study? What system or process should there be to produce emulation and interest? Ought actual exercises in drawing, painting, modeling, and the praxis of art be required of academic students? or would simple lectures, and the most elementary illustrative class-instruction be sufficient? Should a thorough education in any one department of Art, say of Architecture, be aimed at, or only the general presentation and discussion of the subject of Art? Ought scholarships to be instituted for the continuous prosecution of artistic study by those who evince decided talent or desire to study? Should such a school aim to make professional artists of a few, or confine itself simply to a general diffusion of the refining and elevating influences of such an institution among the many?

These and similar practical questions are to be settled before a University School of Art can work itself into the general plan of study, and go into successful operation. It may be, however, that by once making a beginning, these questions would settle themselves. In any systematic study of Art, there would necessarily be three grand departments: first, the theoretical, or instruction in the fundamental principles of æsthetics, in what might be called the philosophy of Art as related to the constitution of the human mind and the universal laws of truth; second, the historical, or instruction in the development and progress of Art in the various epochs of the world's civilization, and in connection with the different phases of human thought and life; third, the practical, or instruction in the practice of Art, and the varied details of artistic education. Of course each particular branch of art

would demand its own special course of study and instruction. Architecture as a useful art, would perhaps form the chief study and every-day employment of an Art School. It would be its central theme. The rules of Architecture are definite and scientific, more capable of being taught to the many than those of any other branch of Art, and its study would produce certain and direct results on general education. Why should not good architects be reared by a college, as well as good chemists or physicians?

To aid this course of artistic instruction, there should be good models in all the departments. A gallery of pictures is indispensable, but only if they be good pictures, if they be judged of qualitatively instead of quantitatively. On no point, we think, should there be a stricter censorship than here. A man may be allowed to have a tolerable painting in his private parlor, for, perhaps, it is the best he can afford; but good models are imperatively needed in a school of Art. To be sure, we cannot expect to have the riches of the Old World galleries, or the best pictures in the world at first; but no absolutely bad picture, false in drawing, crude in conception, glaring and unnatural in coloring should be admitted. In sculpture, since original works of great merit are at first out of the question, plaster casts of the most celebrated statues, taken from the originals, and not second hand, are required.

In architecture, models, elevations and plans, with a good collection of architectural photographs, would be needed. A room devoted exclusively to engravings, illustrating the history and progress of that interesting art, would also be an important addition. These, with the various instruments and technical appliances requisite for the thorough fitting out and furnishing of a School of Art, and above all, proper instruction in the different departments, would be an affair of considerable magnitude, and would call largely upon the generosity of the true patrons of education in the land. We have no royal or noble patrons of our schools and seats of learning, but there is a strong spirit of affectionate loyalty among the alumni of our colleges towards the parent institution, and a desire to make them all that the needs of an advancing civilization demand. There is also a growing liberality among our merchant princes

towards all that fosters a broad idea of education. There is also an increasing love of art in this class. The steadily growing appreciation of art and artists in the city of New York, from the time of Jarvis and the founding of the Academy, to the present, when such great sums are given for the paintings of our native artists, forms in itself a remarkable history.

In conclusion, for its bearing upon the relation of art to education, we will give an extract from a letter recently received from an able, practical instructor in one of our American Schools of Design. "My idea respecting art studies is that every one ought to take drawing as a regular part of his education at school, thus developing the judgment in regard to form, proportion, &c. This is useful in every walk of life, and needs but little time, being at the same time a rest for the brain after severer study. Then, when the usual common course of study is completed a youth will know whether he has power to pursue those branches where drawing is requisite—such as engineering, architecture, &c. I would, as far as possible, discourage the pursuit of art as a means of livelihood. The brilliant success of a Bierstadt or a Church (after long years of foreign study and travel, which are lost sight of by aspirants) has lured on many students, who would have been far better in a surveyor's office or an iron foundry, who scramble through a miserable life, blaming the Fates because they cannot sell their poor pictures. If there be talent it will break down all obstacles, but let not youth be deceived by the flattery of an admiring and ignorant home circle."

ARTICLE II.—CONTEMPORARY ENGLAND.

History of The Peace: being a History of England from 1816 to 1854. With an Introduction, 1800 to 1815. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. Vols. I.—IV. Boston: Walker, Fuller & Co. 1864—66.

Les Anglais peints par eux-mêmes was the title which a vivacious Frenchman chose to give to his sketch, drawn with English materials, of English habits and character. Some uncivil "Punch" or Jerrold flung back a hint that a more entertaining work would be "*Les Françaises peintes par elles-mêmes*. But in spite of the sneer, the title was a taking one; and we may suspect that there was some bitter truth in the book which extorted the sarcasm. Certainly, if one paints his own portrait, we may criticise his art, we may accuse him of heightening the beauties or hiding the blemishes of his proper person; but we shall hardly suspect him of painting himself blacker than he is. The autographic likenesses of a hundred masters adorn the Uffizi Gallery at Florence; if any of them has failed to do justice to his own comeliness, he must endure to be misapprehended; out of his own mouth is he condemned. As with men, so with nations; we can hardly wrong them if we accept the pictures their own ablest delineators draw of them.

In the testimony which they bear, unconsciously or sorrowfully, against the public character and the public deeds of the British nation in this century, consists no little of the value, and very much of the interest, of the volumes named at the head of this Article. It cannot be doubted that within these half-dozen years that side of public opinion here which looked kindly upon English things and men, not inquiring too closely, so long as they were English, whether they were worthy or not, has been undergoing sharp revision. The charm is broken, under the inspiration of which so many American plenipotentiaries have been moved to after dinner eloquence at

Guildhall and the Mansion House; the spell of a common ancestry and language, Magna Charta, Shakespeare, and the rest of it. It may be well if, in the freedom of inquiry into which recent events have emancipated us, we rush into no harsher judgment of the England of our times than is fairly gathered from the record of the work before us. Perhaps, too, an examination of this History of the Forty Years' Peace, even though induced by the sole motive of testing the value of our Anglophilist prejudices, of proving the quality of the meat on which this our Cæsar hath fed to fatness, may show us some public dangers overcome or escaped, which 'we may have to meet, some public crimes perpetrated or prevented, to which we may be tempted. Nor would it be easy to present more compactly the various lessons, political, economical, and social, which English experience during the period recorded teaches the offspring of Englishmen, than they are tabulated in the preface with which the author introduces to American readers this enlarged edition of her work. We may doubt, indeed, whether the attitude of England toward other nations, during the first half of this century, has been exactly a pattern for our imitation; whether it may not have shown a trifle too much of truculence toward weaker powers, of truckling toward strong ones; whether the means by which "a peace of forty years was preserved by the foremost European nation" may not after all have been at times less honorable even than war; whether in the way of financial legislation, of progress in the great science of taxation, of dealing with disaffected provinces, this half-century of English history may not have more to teach us by way of warning than of example. But however this may be, it cannot be doubted that, if the value of history is in its lessons, the history of a nation in many things so kindred to ours, in an age so near ours, through vicissitudes of which some that are pressing upon us are but the copy, should be worth more than all other history to us. Admitting, therefore, the faults so often inherent in contemporary histories, their aptness to degenerate into mere chronicle, that they are biased by partisan passions, that the nearness of events destroys mental perspective, and distorts their true proportions; yet we cannot afford to be ignorant of re-

cent events, while we study ancient ones. If we can get no better story of the great Reform contest than a digest of newspapers and Hansard's Debates, let us take that thankfully, and hope that another age may have a history of it as free at least from factious sympathies as are our latest stories of Cæsar and the Pompeians, or of Charles Stuart and the Puritans.

Making just allowance for the imperfections that must attend every chronicle of the author's own times, some of which we have just hinted at, and for the special disadvantages under which this work was written, the History of the Peace is entitled to high praise as a compact, vivid, graphic panorama of a most eventful half-century in English history. We do not regard it as one of those disadvantages that in many of the controversies which agitated the little island during the period in question, the historian herself was an earnest and effective participant. That historic impartiality which comes from indifference to the issue of the conflict, if it ever exists, is a doubtful virtue. If historians must have sympathies, better the enlightened partisanship of one who has fought the battles than the stolid partiality of a bystander who has looked on and taken a side, without taking part. Miss Martineau is not the worse, but the better fitted to tell the things she has seen, that she can add to the *quæ ipse vidi* the *quorum pars fui*; and the special disadvantage to which we have alluded as belonging to this work, is only that it has been composed at different times, and even with the interference of other hands. With but a slight exception, the first Book, covering a period of half-a-dozen eventful years, is the work, not of a single pen only, but of several, other than her own; and it is not too much to pronounce these chapters precisely the least vigorous, the least animated, and (for such is the current phrase, however inapt for this exact case) the least masculine of all the four volumes. Fortunately, however, Miss Martineau's co-laborers are men who regard the subjects of which they treat from nearly her point of view; and as they are no less faithful than she is in presenting those subjects as they see them, a reasonable unity is maintained throughout their joint production.

Beginning with a brief, dramatic sketch of England in the last years of the eighteenth century, socially, politically, and

as a member of the commonwealth of nations, the introductory volume carries the reader rapidly through the military and diplomatic transactions which ended in the Treaty of Amiens, the rupture of that treacherous peace, the tumult of European war which followed it; Trafalgar, Austerlitz, Moscow, Leipsic, Waterloo; Tilsit, Cintra, Châtillon, Paris, and the "finality" of Vienna; the Peninsular war, and the Walcheren expedition. In this is mingled enough of domestic history to show that with all changes of ministries, bargains of factions, brawlings of demagogues, disorders of the famished, civilization and humanity could go only backward under the pressure of these fifteen years of going to other people's wars; while three distinct episodes present compactly the spasmodic Irish outbreak under Robert Emmett in 1803; the Indian fighting and governing of Arthur Wellesley; and the needless and inglorious war with the United States. The chapter which concisely tells the story of what we called for so many years "the last war," is a model, not only of compendious narrative, but of that impartiality which alone befits the historian, that honest sense of justice which recognizes right whether "on heathen or on Christian ground," and which hates a meanness or a folly only the more if detected in one's own household. The events which culminated in what Miss Martineau calls "a contest as purposeless, as foolish, as unnecessary, as it was ill-managed, useless, and, merely as war, discreditable to us," are fairly, if not with thorough accuracy, set forth, as well as its general cause and results. Among the causes of that war, it is interesting to note the imputation which Mr. Madison is reported to have made, in 1835, in conversation with "an English visitor," that as "the Droits of the Admiralty carried to the Crown a large share of the captured property of the enemy," this mere pecuniary interest of the Regent, amounting during the two years and a half of this war, to 1,000,000 *l.* a year, helped to explain why the war was not prevented. Among its current events are told in new words those old stories, so familiar to us, the hideous crimes of savages whom Christian England adopted as allies; the barbarian acts of British officers themselves in the destruction of Washington, of which it is said that "the Americans themselves were

hardly more indignant at the nature of the ravage than the inhabitants of every country in Europe who heard of it;” the improvising of an American navy, with its marvelous supremacy; the “great and fatal battle” of New Orleans, seeming more like an Old Testament miracle, or a medieval myth of Clovis and the Visigoths, with its thirteen Americans killed and wounded, and its British loss of 3,000. All these details are given with an unwilling frankness which seems to find relief in such a bit of home administration as this: the War Office, at great cost of money and trouble, sends out water-casks for use on the great lakes, “the officials having forgotten (if indeed they knew) that the lake water was fresh.” And it would be hard to sum up more fairly the results of this causeless contest than it is done in these closing sentences of the same short chapter:

“The treaty of Ghent left almost everything where it was before the war. The mutual concessions of parties, both eager for peace, amounted to little more than postponing the most difficult questions for future settlement. * * * Nothing was gained, on either side, in regard to the ostensible objects of the war. * * * The English were enabled to declare themselves at peace with all the world; and it only remained for all to wish that the folly and crime had never been committed, and that from the records of history could be torn that page which must contain the narrative of the bootless war of 1812-15.” (Vol. I, p. 398.)

Here, at this Treaty of Ghent, which made peace universal among nations called civilized, begins, with the second volume, the main narrative, to which all the first has been merely introductory. Henceforth the record is more English, less European; less a mere chronicle of military operations, dismal but entertaining; more the story of statesmen and statecraft, and of a great people, and what they are, and suffer, and do. Hitherto the conflict in which England engages has been between the principles of progress and immobility upon the arena of the continent; now, having helped to determine it, she finds it renewed upon her own soil, less bloodily indeed, but not less obstinately, and the victories not all upon the side of the things that are, over the things that ought to be. This eternal and “irrepressible conflict” had been dormant at home, while every nerve of national power was strained together in the foreign struggles. The History of the Peace is the history of the same

conflict, with other weapons, and with victories no less renowned than those of the war that was now closed.

A brisk series of sketches of the *dramatis personæ* introduces us promptly to this new controversy, and especially to two phases of it which are the fullest of practical lessons to us; the fight with the old demon of protection, which opened at once upon the closing of the war, just as our fight with it is opening now; the struggle with an exaggerated and depreciated, because irredeemable, currency, with a vast debt contracted in that currency to be paid in a higher, and with a burdensome and wasteful system of taxation. These various parallel struggles, or rather these various forms of the same great conflict, as well as those others of which, fortunately, we are finding no close copy in our own experience;—the battle for religious freedom, now nearly half won; and the battle for popular government, which seems to have been stayed by the compromise of 1832;—are traced far upon their course in the second volume, which closes with the dissolution of Parliament in 1826. Volume three is illustrated by splendid triumphs of the progressive principle, in the repeal of dissenters' disabilities in 1828;—the Catholic Emancipation of 1829, the Parliamentary Reform, effected by the most unconstitutional intimidation from the ministry above, and the populace beneath, in 1832; the new poor-law of 1834, perhaps not less important than any other reform in its effect on the prosperity and morality of the English people; the well-meant and ill-managed abolition of colonial slavery in 1834; the sorely needed, but bungling and unphilosophical reorganization of municipal corporations in 1835. Following upon this record of victories, the fourth and last volume narrates the more conclusive triumph of free-trade in the abolition of the corn-laws; gives a luminous review of Irish disorders and "repeal" agitations, of Scottish church division, of heresies and controversies in the English church, of sweeping improvements, the more violent at last because so stubbornly opposed, in civil and criminal law; with such a glimpse of parallel European events as is needed for illustration, a glance at colonial and American relations, a faithful picture of the atrocious opium-war with China; and finally, in

the supplemental chapters which now first see the light, the commencement of the Crimean war in 1854.

We doubt if there are many Americans, even among New Englanders, who can read the four entertaining volumes of which we have given an outline, without feeling the question to stir in their hearts, if not to frame itself into words upon their lips, "Is this England, of which we read, the England of our day? The England which arrogates to itself among the nations the character of guide, of pattern, of exemplar, of *custos morum*, even of *arbiter elegantiarum*? Is this the consummate diplomacy, this the warlike prowess, this the internal administration, to which the ruder outside world, and especially ourselves, an insensate and degenerate offspring, are so often invited to turn for lessons of wisdom? Nay, even, can these, of whom we read, be that grand English people, whose civilization, whose humanity, whose enlightened Christianity entitles them to say to all Christendom beside, 'I am holier than thou?'" And should we, after all, be greatly unjust if we deemed some of these British statesmen in our age to be, like some of our own, narrow partisans, corrupt politicians, cruel and dishonest in their ways of attaining to power, and in their administering of office when reached? If in answering these questions an old idol or two, even a fondly loved or a reverently worshiped one, be toppled over, we shall have at least a pedestal on which to set up something truer and better.

When that foreign minister whom Byron, embellishing with a new epithet that noble tongue which we Americans are said to corrupt with barbarisms, has sweetly called,

"Carotid-artery-slitting Castlereagh,"

in an insane paroxysm left his portfolio to fall into the vigorous hands of Canning, the foreign policy of England had been, almost since first a foreign policy was possible, one, simple, easy of comprehension. Founded upon certain principles which had now begun to be somewhat earnestly questioned; that the interests of every government must be, from the nature of things, in conflict on the one hand with the interests of every other government, and on the other hand with the interests of its own people; that nevertheless, as a general rule,

all governments had one interest in common, opposed to that of all the subject peoples, that of self-preservation; and that, in rare exceptional cases, the interest of a government in the overthrow of another might be so strong as to control the primary class interest, and justify the maintenance of insurrection against its enemy; the application of the policy to any state of affairs was easily determined. The means by which to attain the obvious objects of foreign policy being first, cunning, second, force, the duty of the foreign minister was constantly to defraud or to rob such other power as should present, all things considered, the fairest opportunity. But as the same principles inspired the conduct of every other nation, it was rare that England was not either finding occasion for violence in the weakness of a neighbor, or offering such occasion herself. Up to that momentous suicide, therefore, the history of England, in its foreign relations, records little but dishonest attacks upon other powers, in the interest of the English government, or defense against like attacks, or occasional intervention in the common interest of governments, against rebellious subjects, or rarely, in the supposed special interest of the English monarchy, for rebellious subjects against their sovereign.

We are quite ready to agree with Miss Martineau that the death of Lord Londonderry and the accession of Canning to the Foreign Office is "the parting point of the former and the later foreign policy of England;" an incident "of inestimable importance, and worthy of earnest notification in history." Henceforth, and even to our day, British diplomacy was to bear a character different in many respects from its former character, and we will not say it was not, at the beginning at least, a better character. Whatever else Britain was now to appear among European nations, she was no longer to personate the knight-errant, dashing full tilt into the redress of others' wrongs, or of what, from a medieval point of view, might seem their wrongs; and no longer the *condottiere*, whose free lance mingled in every fray which promised booty. Nor need it be doubted that when the new policy was inaugurated by the instructions with which the Duke of Wellington was sent to the Congress of Verona, Mr. Canning himself, as well as the

liberals of the whole world, may have indulged a vague hope that the new policy was to be something more and better than the mere negation of the old; something positive, as well as negative; not merely the withdrawal of British help, in the conflict of principles, from the side represented by the Holy Alliance, but the transfer of the same efficient aid, if needed, to the struggling nations which it had so often contributed to crush. That some such noble aspiration stirred the vehement mind of Canning, may fairly be read in the eloquent orations, and hardly less in the energetic dispatches, that embellish the four years during which he gave direction to English diplomacy. From the "brave words" which declared in the House of Commons that the British government "would not tolerate for an instant any cession which Spain might make of colonies over which she did not exercise a direct and positive influence," down to the famous and fiery speech which reviewed, from the verge of another life, the administration that had been only pacific, when liberals of all Christendom had hoped it would be aggressive for good; that speech in which, while vindicating the inertness that had suffered Spain to be trampled by French regiments, he uttered the splendid boast, "I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old;" through all these declarations the minister may be seen to fret under the feeling that he has muzzled the lion, and that the lion that will fight, if only for carrion, is sometimes the more admired beast. Still more can the action of that impulse, which in his lifetime had to content itself with the dissolution of the Holy Alliance, and with some good words of promise, "that whenever the war of opinion should involve Great Britain, the aspirants to political freedom should be on her side," be discerned in the Greek intervention, which was almost the first act of Canning's successors, and the first and only practical result of his progressive sympathies.

While, therefore, we fully recognize the sharp deflection from old channels which Canning's hand imposed on all subsequent English diplomacy, we may be permitted to doubt whether Canning himself, if he could read with us this "History of the Peace" of which himself is the hero, would acknowledge as his offspring the policy which kept the peace; whether he would

honor more the nineteenth century statesmanship of Aberdeen and Russell, even though it sometimes kept out of quarrels, than Cromwell's or William's in the seventeenth, or Walpole's in the eighteenth, or even Pitt's or Castlereagh's in his own time, though they kept England in incessant war. Honoring the author's hero more than she herself does, we cannot accept for him the unappreciative praise with which she declares that "his principle was the preservation of peace." We cannot but see, indeed, in all his statecraft the firm purpose that at all events there should be an end to English wars for the maintenance of despotism; and "to this end his immediate practical purpose was to dissolve, by the quietest means, the Holy Alliance." But wars for the overthrow of despotism, wars for the defense of violated constitutions, of outraged freedom, of throttled nationality, of these there was no question when Canning came to power. To bring to an end English fighting for the Holy Alliance was a work fit for the greatest of men: to turn English power at once against the Holy Alliance, for this the might of a demi-god would have been unequal. Canning, like a great statesman, set his mark within the bounds of the possible; and he attained it. It is a eulogy which makes false or meaningless his grandest words, to say that having rendered England powerless for evil, he could have kept her impotent for good.

It is unfortunate for the honor of England among nations, unfortunate for the cause of progress everywhere, and therefore unfortunate for the peace of the world, which depends upon reasonable concessions to the spirit of progress, that the principle which Miss Martineau mistakenly honors as Canning's, should in fact have impressed itself, under the sanction of his great name, upon all British statesmanship from his day to ours: the principle, that is, of preserving peace at (almost) any price. What would now be the state of Europe, had the liberalism which Canning introduced into English counsels been suffered to act in them with the energy he would have displayed, instead of the peevish, threatening inaction which has in fact characterized them, no man, of course, can say. But it is only applying the simplest rules of reasoning to judge that a manly assertion, in the face of the world, of English de-

votion to justice and liberty, and of English readiness to sacrifice something in their defense, might have cost less in blood and treasure than that Crimean war alone, into which a belief of English pusillanimity led the Czar, and yet might have prevented many a wrong, and brought England into a better position to-day than that in which, though at the zenith of her material strength, she is hated by every nation on earth that does not despise her, and scorned by all that do not hate her.

We have spoken of the Greek intervention of 1827 as being Canning's own enterprise, accomplished upon his own plans by his immediate successors. We may add that it was a vindication which, however righteous, executed as it was by the conjoined Russian, French, and English Empires upon the decrepit Ottoman power, lacked almost every element of heroism. Yet this brief effort is the solitary fruit which, so far as foreign relations are concerned, with all its fair blossoming of encouragements and promises, English liberalism has borne in the nineteenth century.

Let us not be misunderstood. We are far from attributing to the English nation the duty of rushing into the armed defence of justice and liberty abroad. We recognize the blessings of peace and the awful calamities of war, and the eminent advantage of maintaining the one and avoiding the other. But we have a right to charge that the history of what is called "The Peace" of those forty years shows too many instances, on the one hand of blustering encouragement of the weak to resistance or revolution, followed by perfidious defection in the contest thus incited; and on the other hand, of savage wars, undertaken for the basest purposes of fancied national interest, by this same power which pretends at once to be ardently liberal in sentiment, and excluded by pacific principle from backing its sentiments by action. We have a certain meed of approval for the mild mercantile citizen who can slip through a riotous crowd in peace, not giving and unapt to take offense, unmixed in others' quarrels, and even capable of looking on dispassionately at the throttling of a neighbor, if he be suffered to peddle his own wares unmolested. But the hurly ruffian who swaggers about with cudgel in fist, breaking heads freely

where the probable gain of watches or purses seems to balance the risk, stimulating weak men to resist the imposition of strong ones by assurances of sympathy and hints of help, and leaving them then at the mercy of their exasperated oppressors ; this is hardly a lovely character, either among men or nations. A few examples will show whether the conduct of Great Britain during this period resembles that of either, or both, of these imaginary persons.

Before Mr. Canning's untimely death, the world had had a two-fold opportunity of learning what was to be expected of liberal England. At the Congress of Vienna, the Duke of Wellington's instructions from the new Foreign Secretary directed his withdrawal in the event of the powers agreeing to invade Spain, overthrow the constitution, and impose the despotism of the imbecile Ferdinand upon his unwilling subjects. This event occurred ; the English envoy withdrew ; and the Holy Alliance was broken. The invasion, in anticipation of which the British government had ruptured the firmest diplomatic ties that could bind it, took place, and was promptly followed by the announcement of British neutrality.

" The declaration of neutrality was painful and disconcerting to some of the best men in Parliament and out of it. They were so accustomed to speak of England as the champion of the liberties of the world, and had so completely understood her secession from the Holy Alliance as declaratory of this, that it appeared to them a disgrace to look on, without taking part in one of the most indefensible wars against liberty which had ever been entered into. The Foreign Secretary had much to encounter in the House—angry rebuke from some, and pathetic expostulation from others." (Vol. II., page 334.)

It was not many months before England had again to decide for belligerency or neutrality. It is a tradition, having its source in the days when Spain was a mighty empire, and the "natural enemy" of England, that Portugal, her feeble neighbor, was equally England's natural ally ; and although any foundation which may have once existed for the importance attached to the alliance had long since vanished, the tradition, as usual among a people who know how to "stand upon the ancient ways" long after their foundations are gone, subsists in full force. This "ancient and faithful ally" was now in danger. A hostile though unauthorized inroad had been

made by certain bodies of armed men from Spain. A piteous appeal was made to the English government for help; and within a week after the application was received, a British army was afloat, on its way to the Tagus.

In 1835, again, came the Carlist war in Spain. Perhaps the Carlist leaders were not pure patriots; their followers, perhaps, were no better than banditti; but no one will ascribe lofty virtues to the Queen's party. Ostensibly, too, the Carlists were liberals, whose aim was the reëstablishment of that constitution upon whose overthrow the Queen's government was built. In short, it was one of those "wars of opinion" in which it had been promised that "the aspirants to political freedom should find Great Britain on their side." Of course then, men and money were hurried off to the struggling Carlists, with as prompt enthusiasm as to the menaced Portuguese government nine years before? Let Miss Martineau tell the story:

"When the Queen's government became alarmed by the successes of the Carlists in that year, the Cabinet applied for aid to the three powers in alliance with Spain—Britain, France, and Portugal. Britain declined to send troops, though she would not object to France doing so; and the arms and ammunition already furnished, to the amount of 200,000*l.*, were considered sufficient. * * * * The Spanish Cabinet next desired of the King of England that he would suspend the Foreign Enlistment Act, that the Spanish government might raise in England a body of 11,000 mercenaries. This was done in June, 1835; and during the summer months, the strange spectacle was seen of recruiting through the towns and villages of Great Britain. It is impossible that the merits of the case could have been understood by all those who enlisted." (Vol. IV., page 110.)

Nor was it enough to suspend, for the help of a vile despotism against its own subjects, that Foreign Enlistment Act which, passed in 1819 for the avowed purpose of intercepting English aid to the young South American Republics in their wars of independence with this same Spanish monarchy, our own times have found incapable of checking the most active intervention on behalf of an atrocious rebellion in a free and kindred nation. For before the end of this Carlist war we find the British Marine Corps fighting side by side with these same mercenaries, and a proclamation declaring that every Englishman who had used his exceptional freedom of enlistment to engage himself with the revolutionists, would be put to death, if captured, as a traitor to the King of England!

But our own recollection, of times too recent even for this history, is full of like instances. There have been "wars of opinion" in Europe many a time since then; but no English sword has been drawn in them. There have been base and bloody wars since then, in Europe and all over the world, for territorial aggrandizement, for commercial advantage, or from cowardly dread of another nation's growing greatness; and in these English blood has flowed in rivers. We can remember certain wars for liberty and nationality, with which, bursting forth first in volcanic Sicily, the whole continent blazed in 1848; we can remember many good English words of incitement before them, and stimulus during them, and how every nation in turn sent up its expiring cry at last for English help; but Sicily, Rome, Venice, Hungary, Germany, implored in vain, and succumbed to other intervention, upon which Canning could never have looked with those "neutral" eyes through which his successors see. Still later have we seen the Italian people encouraged by English sympathy to the effort, hopeless if unaided, to shake off its alien tyrants. No one can travel through renewed Italy, since 1859, without observing the bitterness with which Italians remark that though they had many good words from England, and few from France, they had a quarter of a million French bayonets, and not one English; and how all those generous affections which for forty years had looked to England as the champion of universal freedom, are now turned to rancor.

Execrated, however, as the name of England doubtless is by Spanish and Italian liberals, there is another peninsula which has resounded, twice within the lifetime of one man, with no less bitter reproaches against her; once for the most hideous outrage, in time of perfect peace, which one Christian nation has perpetrated upon another for a century past; and once for desertion in sore need, after such talk of friendship and support as made the defection seem as perfidious as the stealthy violence had been before. It is too soon for any one to have forgotten the myriads of brave words from English people, press, parliament, and ministry, which stiffened the stout little Danish kingdom into resistance to the demands of confederated Germany, or the cruelly unequal war in which Denmark was

left to succumb unaided. It seems hard that one man should have had a hand in two such cruelties to one weak and friendly nation, and at such an interval as separates the years 1807 and 1864. But the same Palmerston, who, as premier, "led Denmark to take up arms and then left her to her fate," * had been sitting a year in Parliament when Canning, "the hero of the peace," devised and ordered, as Foreign Secretary, the destruction of the Danish capital and fleet. Of the administration which perpetrated that crime, the youth Palmerston was a supporter, and, a few months later, a member. It may be well to see how that career was initiated which, after sixty years of unblushing public profligacy, and of private profligacy but thinly veiled, has just closed in a transfiguration of English love and reverence. We give the story, with some condensation, as Miss Martineau tells it; premising that it is the narrative of one who justifies the atrocity which, nevertheless, she finds these words to describe.

"Mr. Jackson, who had been for some years our envoy at Berlin, was sent to Kiel, to require of the Crown Prince, who was known to be under intimidation by Napoleon, that the Danish navy should be delivered over to England, to be taken care of in British ports, and restored at the end of the war. The Crown Prince refused, with the indignation which was to be expected. His position was an extremely hard one, and our king showed his sense of this by the *mot* which he uttered to Mr. Jackson on his return, and which he liked to tell. He abruptly asked Mr. Jackson whether the Prince was up stairs or down when he received the British Envoy. 'It was on the ground floor, please your Majesty.' 'I am glad of it, for your sake,' replied the king; 'for if he had half my spirit, he would have kicked you down stairs.' * * *

"Mr. Jackson had been escorted, when he went forth on his mission, by twenty ships of the line, forty frigates, and other assistant vessels, and a fleet of transports, conveying 27,000 land troops. Admiral Gambier commanded the naval, and Lord Cathcart the military expedition. These forces had been got ready within a month, with great ability, and under perfect secrecy. * * * When, therefore, Mr. Jackson was indignantly dismissed by the Crown Prince, no time was to be lost in seizing the fleet. The Prince sent a messenger with all speed to Copenhagen to command that the place should be put in the best possible state of defense. The messenger arrived on the 10th of August, in the evening, and great was the consternation in the city, for there was hardly a gun on the ramparts, and the armed troops were quite insufficient for the crisis. The Prince came from Kiel the next day, to give his orders in person. He was attended only by his court officers, and was therefore allowed to pass through the British fleet. Mr.

* Blackwood's Magazine, August, 1864, page 247. Am. Ed.

Jackson followed him, to make one more effort for a peaceable agreement; and it was then that the Prince made that declaration about the value of the English alliance, which has before been quoted.* The next day, he retired into Jutland. Contrary winds detained the English ships for three days more; and those three days were diligently used by the Danes. * * *

"And now the affair was decided. There could be no doubt as to what the end must be—so vast a force being sent without notice, in a time of peace between the two countries, against an unprepared city. By the first of September, however, Stralsund was occupied by the French, and part of the British force was detached to watch them; and this proved that it would have been fatal to lose time. By the 8th of September all was over; the Danish navy and arsenal were surrendered. One-fourth of the buildings of the city were by that time destroyed, and in one street 500 persons were killed by the bombardment. One resident whose house was near the walls left his military service for a moment, to remove his three daughters to a place of greater safety. All the three were killed by the bursting of a shell, and in the same night his only son fell by his side, while both were fighting on the walls. The next day, when the British were passing through the street, the old man pointed to the bodies of his children, and fell dead beside them. Many were the hearts so broken during the four days of the bombardment; and we find an Eldon as much moved as a Wilberforce at the details of the intolerable calamities inflicted while the city was like an inhabited volcano.

* * * Efforts were made to conciliate [!] the Danes, after all was over; but, as was very natural, in vain. Notice was even given by them that British flags of truce must not be sent within gunshot range. For many months, the emotions of rage and horror which swelled in the hearts of all Danes continued to spread over the world. On the 28th of the next January, the flame of war caught the establishments on the banks of the Hooghly. It was the birth-day of the King of Denmark, and the residents of the Danish factory in Bengal had invited the English, as usual, to a festival in honor of the day. At six in the morning, the aged chief agent, speechless with horror, showed a countryman the British flag flying from their own staff. Every Danish ship was seized, and the British, who were to have been guests, were masters of the Factory. The youngest Danes present have felt that day to be the most intolerable of their lives.

"Almost as soon as the news of the achievement reached England, the victors brought the Danish fleet into Portsmouth harbor. One of the most painful features of the case is the confiscation which ensued, because the surrender was not made quietly. At the moment of the attack, there were Danish merchantmen in our waters, with cargoes worth 2,000,000*l*. These we took possession of; and, of course, of the navy which we had carried off. Lord Sidmouth and others moved in Parliament for such custody of the ships being ordered as should enable us to restore them in good order at the end of the war; but the answer was that, those terms having been refused, the ships were ours on the ground preferred by the Danes themselves. This was true; but it was one of those truths by which Napoleon's crimes [!] put all honorable and humane minds to the torture. It is with

* "You offer us your alliance," said the Prince, "but we know what it is worth. Your allies, who have been vainly expecting your succors for a whole year, have taught us what is the worth of English friendship." (Vol. I., p. 234.)

a painful sense of something like constructive hypocrisy that we read now of the efforts which the kind-hearted men of the time made to get rid of the moral pain of the occasion. Wilberforce rejoices in Admiral Gambier's ascription of the glory and our own safety to Providence; is consoled by the hope that the chief injury to Copenhagen was done, not by bombs, but by rockets, which set the houses on fire without killing the inhabitants; (Congreve was there making trial of his new invention;) and labors at a subscription for the relief of the Danes; and strives to persuade his friends that they should raise out of their private means, the amount of the soldiers' and sailors' prize money, that the Danish ships might be eventually restored. It would not do. The affair could not be deprived of its character of a desperate and exasperating calamity, for which Napoleon [!] was answerable." (Vol. I, pp. 229-248.)

And yet Englishmen wonder why the world hates them!

In the light of that humanity which, in 1864, could not raise a hand to save the national life of a Christian, Protestant ally, it is easy to appreciate the devotion which, in 1854, hurried to the defense of that effete Ottoman Empire which exists only for the suppression of Christianity and freedom. We shall not spare words upon the impudent assumption which calls the Crimean war, so far as England is concerned, by any better title than that of a war for the balance of power in Europe, for the maintenance of British influence in the East, and above all, for the obstruction of Russian progress toward the Indies.

The Crimean war, however, is out of the scope of our history. Within it are still certain wars upon which we have not touched, but which form the ghastliest chapters in the chronicles of this century. No words of ours can intensify the picture which Miss Martineau's pen has drawn of the infamous purpose and the nefarious conduct of the "opium war" with China; a picture of what, were the chief actor any nation but the English, might seem incredible folly and impossible crime. We use these hard words deliberately; for except the Chinese nation itself, there is no great people on the globe so incapable of comprehending foreign ideas and usages as the English, and in this incomprehension is one source of that great wrong. It would be impossible further to condense the author's compact narrative of the Chinese war; but a few extracts may serve at once to illustrate the noble honesty of her book, and to advance our further purpose of testing the public virtue of those who are so busy in casting stones at their neighbors.

"A policy of peace," says the writer, "has been the deliberate

choice of the Empire of China." "The statesmen of China are ready to explain, when they can find foreigners able to understand the language, and willing to know their minds, that they abjure conquest for the same reasons which make them avoid danger of a military despotism, because they desire a settled and industrial mode of life for their people," &c. It would be a generous Chinese who could describe the English peace-policy in terms as favorable as those!

"When the possibility of assaults from Europe and America presented itself to them, they declare that they weighed the comparative merits of the two plans; and here again deliberately made their choice,—to abide by their peace-policy. * * * The Americans have long understood all this, and acted upon their knowledge, seeking no political relations with China before the British compelled them to do so, but carrying on a most lucrative trade, and maintaining the most friendly private relations with the Chinese, by means of merchant vessels, without a hint of naval armaments, and through the agency of supercargoes, without any mention of ambassadors.

"The principle of Chinese policy may be judged by nations or individuals,—it may be admired, excused, criticized, wondered at, pitied, or laughed at; but it is a principle,—entitled to the respect due to principles wherever they are found. It may be that the immutable policy of China itself must be proved, like all work of men's brains and hands, subject to mutation under the operation of time. It may be that, to Europeans and Americans, such a policy may appear not only blind and weak, but morally indefensible; but not the less is it a very serious thing to explode a system so ancient, so full of purpose, and so energetically preserved. If the exploding process is begun in ignorance and self-interest, and carried on in ignorance and a spirit of scorn, it is a more than serious,—it is a sad and solemn matter. This process took place under the successive Whig Administrations, from the formation of the Cabinet of Lord Grey to the dissolution of that of Lord Melbourne; but it was not the Whig ministers alone who were responsible in the matter. The melancholy ignorance and scorn which led us into what will ever be called the opium war were shared by the opposition, and by the great body of the nation. What faults of management there were must be imputed to the ministers of the day, and their supporters in this affair among the opposition; but, if hereafter the opium war with China appears in the eyes of the historian and the moralist a disgrace, it will be as a national disgrace; for the people put no effectual check upon the government, but rather stimulated its action, by sharing its ignorance, and vying with its spirit of scorn. There was scarcely a school boy on the American sea-board who could not have justly rebuked our city electors, our newspaper editors, and our statesmen of every party, about our opium war.

"It is probable that this war would never have taken place if our knowledge of the Chinese had been sufficient to allay our spirit of scorn. The popular English notion of the Chinese seems to have been held by the government, and the agents they sent out, who might have learned better by seeking information from merchants resident many years in the country. The general notion of

China was, and is, of a country dreadfully over-peopled, so that multitudes are compelled to live in boats, floating about to pick up dead dogs for food; that they are tyrannized over by a Tartar government, which they would fain be rid of, and by an aristocracy which will permit no middle class; that they call foreigners "barbarians," and designate Europeans by foul epithets instead of their proper names: and that their sole endeavor, in regard to foreigners, is to insult and mock them. Merchants of any nation who have lived long enough in the neighborhood of the Chinese to be qualified to speak of them, give a very different account from this. They declare that the government is, on the whole, favorable to the industry and comfort of the people; that the people are easy and contented; that the rights of property are respected, and that there is a large and wealthy middle class; that literature is the highest pursuit; that the Chinese possess a greater body of literature than Europe can show; and that nothing is known among us of its quality, as it remains wholly unexplored; that the notion of insulting epithets being applied to our agents in lieu of their own names is an utter delusion, arising from ignorance of the fact that the Chinese, having no alphabet, are obliged to express new names by the words in their language which approach nearest in sound. Thus, when Lord Napier fired up at being written down 'laboriously vile,' Mr. Morrison was written down 'a polite horse,' and another resident at Macao, 'a ewt. of hemp.' Such misconceptions of Chinese character and condition, together with our bigoted persistence in conducting intercourse with a singular state according to our own customary methods and forms, and not theirs, were a bad preparation for the management of difficulties, if such should arise; and the event was painful and discreditable accordingly." (Vol. IV., pp. 263-5.)

The production of opium in the British Indian possessions, its use in China, and the pernicious effects of its use, the prohibition of the trade by the Chinese government, the stubborn determination of the British to force the poison into the country in spite of prohibition, the moderation with which the Chinese proceeded to enforce its laws, and the collisions which of necessity ensued, are then described; with some of the odd devices they contrived "to get rid of the encroaching and insolent strangers who had violated their laws to make profit of the intemperance of their people."

"With all this simplicity about war, its horrors were never met or endured by braver men. About this, the testimony is absolutely universal. The most perverse of our countrymen who defend this war at home or on the spot,—who call it a 'just, necessary and honorable war;' who are not afraid to pray for the aid of Heaven against those whom we have oppressed, or to return thanks for victory; or who profess to regard the affair in a missionary light, and talk of bringing the Chinese to the knowledge and love of that Christianity which we have so disgraced in their eyes,—all agree that a nobler courage and constancy were never manifested than by the Chinese who fell in the field, or before their little

forts, or on the threshold of their houses, which they had thought safe from invasion forever, because their own policy was one of peace. British officers might laugh when they saw pasteboard defenses, pasteboard men, and wooden cannon, mixed in among the troops, to make a show and terrify the foreigners; and British sailors, little knowing the mental torture they were inflicting, might jokingly secure their prisoners, by tying them together in sixes by their tails; but there was no man, we are told, from the highest officer to the lowest subordinate, who was not touched by the spectacles of devotedness that he saw when citizens cut the throats of wives and children, and then their own, rather than yield to the terrible foreigners; and when officers in the field sought death with desperation when all chance of victory was over. They no doubt agreed with the saying of their emperor, 'It is no longer possible to bear with the English. Gods and men are indignant at their conduct;' and, when they found these hated strangers victorious, they could no longer endure life. As they heard, after the first British conquest, that the enemy had pushed their opium-trade vigorously, selling 400 chests at very high prices, they might agree with their emperor's public declaration, that it was worth every effort, in war and watchfulness, to prevent the ingress of that depraving religion called Christianity. They could hardly hold any other view, when the only Christians they knew were the opium smugglers, and the officials who conducted war in their defense. They fought, indeed, with as hearty a hatred of the invaders as ever the Saxons felt towards the Normans of old, or the Mexicans against the army of the United States in our day; and no one can deny that they had cause." (Vol. IV., pp. 272-3.)

"It cannot be without much pain and sorrow that, in a History of the Forty Years' Peace, the narrative can be offered of this Chinese war. It is impossible not to see the insolence of the very term; for, if the Chinese had not been too pacific and helpless to withstand our injuries, we should not have had forty years of peace even to talk about. * * * * * Whichever way we look at this affair, there is no comfort,—at least for those who cannot be comforted with dollars, or pride in our warlike resources and experience. We are hated in China, not only as their conquerors, but for our forcing upon their society the contraband drug which they would have kept out of the reach of the intemperate of their people—by means which we may laugh at, but which they had a right to adopt. It is an humbling story; and the wonder to a future generation will be, how we bear the shame of it so easily as we do." (Vol. iv, p. 277.)

But these are not the only diversities which break the monotony of the Forty Years' Peace. In the great Indian Empire, more intermeddling with other people's business, partly from "the precipitancy of fear," partly from "the confidence of ignorance;" more wars induced by the broadest motives of aggrandizement, and conducted with an inefficiency almost as cruel as the barbarities in which the British soldiery vied with their dark-skinned antagonists. Let a few passages show what

manner of wars, in their object and their management, these were :

"The British were now 'advised' by the enemy [in Afghanistan, which they had invaded,] to go back to India; and they were so nearly starved that they agreed to do so, though some of the officers were still of opinion that they should fight their way for the mile and a half which lay between the cantonments and the citadel, and take refuge there, trusting to the interest of the country people to supply them with food. They set out, however, some of them knowing that the Afghan chiefs were saying that they would allow only one man to live; that they would cut off his limbs and set him down at the entrance of the Khyber Pass, with a letter between his teeth warning the British to meddle no more with Afghanistan. Many set forth, believing this boast to be not unreasonable; and it was too true that only one man reached Jelalabad. Those who gave themselves up as prisoners and hostages were saved,—such of them as did not die of fever and hardship,—but only one man performed the march from Cabool to Jelalabad. The doom of the force was clear at the end of five miles. Four thousand five hundred fighting men, and twelve thousand camp-followers, besides women and children, set forth from Cabool on the 6th of January [1842]. The distance traversed that day was only five miles; yet it was two o'clock in the morning before the last of the force came up. The glare from the burning cantonments was visible to the fugitives as they sat in the snow, and heard what had been the destruction already, and knew what a road lay before them. Officers and soldiers lay dead in the bloody snow, all the way back to Cabool; baggage was abandoned at the very gates of the cantonments; the ladies had only what they wore, and some of them, hurried away or sick, wore only night-clothes. Each day was worse than the last. One lady had her youngest boy snatched from her arms by an Afghan; and another saw her eldest girl put into a sack and carried off. The camp-followers, whose frost-bitten feet would carry them no further, died by hundreds along the roadside, or crawled in among the rocks, without food, or prospect of any. On the fourth day, only 270 soldiers were left. On the fifth day, the loss altogether was 12,000 out of 17,000 men. On the eighth day, there were but twenty to make a stand against the still tormenting foe. Twelve escaped from a barrier which detained them cruelly long under the enemy's fire; and of these twelve, six dropped before reaching the last town to be passed. Near this town, some peasants offered bread to the remaining six, who were famishing. They stayed a few moments only, but in those few moments the inhabitants were arming. Two were immediately cut down. The other four fled as men may do who have death at their heels, and safety almost within sight; but three of the four were overtaken and slaughtered within four miles of Jelalabad; and Dr. Brydon arrived alone. He was seen from the fort stooping over his jaded pony, evidently wounded—looking as forlorn in his approach as could be imagined. He was supposed to be a messenger, and the gate was opened in readiness to admit him; but his only message was such a one as perhaps no other man has ever had to deliver,—that he was the sole remnant of an army. Except the burying of Cambyse's army in the African desert, such a destruction has perhaps never been heard of in the world." (Vol. IV., pp. 296-7.)

"In the beginning of November, the British troops left the country which they never should have entered, and where some of them finally disgraced our military reputation by acts of rapine and cruelty, in an expedition in Kohistan, which the Afghans themselves could never have surpassed. It was a fitting end of one of the most iniquitous wars on record. The public despatches and private journals of the time speak, in set terms, of the honor of our arms being avenged, stains wiped out, and so forth; but this is cant. The honor of our arms, among the Asiatic nations as everywhere else, is absolutely implicated with the goodness of our cause. It is questionable whether, in their barbaric view, our cause had ever before been thoroughly bad,—indefensible as have been some of our wars there in the eyes of Christian nations. But in this case we were wholly wrong; and our honor cannot be now—never can be—retrieved in the estimation of the Afghans. For purposes of our own,—foolish purposes as it happens,—we invaded their country; forced on them a sovereign whom they hated, and who had actually no party among them; invited aggression from them by our weakness and supineness; melted away under their aggression; and at last, poured in upon them in overwhelming forces,—blew up their strongholds, razed their cities, hunted their mountain population "like vermin," burning, slaying and ravaging; and then withdrew, giving them leave to place upon the throne the very ruler we had come to depose. We may deceive ourselves with vainglory about our honor; but as long as tradition lasts in Afghanistan, our name will be a mark for hatred and scorn. The men are gone who did this—Burnes, M'Naghten, the military advisers who left their bones in the passes beyond the Punjaub, and Lord Auckland himself. But it does not become those at home who were misled by them—it does not become the most irresponsible of us—to forget this great folly and crime, or to attempt to cover it over with cant about the glory of our arms." (Vol. IV., pp. 299–300.)

At the battle of Sobraon, in 1846, "the slaughter on our side was terrible enough; but that of the Sikhs was sickening to hear of. They were drowned in shoals in the river, and shot by hundreds *as they attempted to escape into their own territory!*" It was plain that the British soldier must be, everywhere and at all times, the same foul fiend against whom our fathers and grandfathers fought; the same of whom these words are written: "The slaughter before St. Sebastian was severe; but it is infinitely more painful to read of the subsequent transactions within it. The brutality of the victors converted that sandy peninsula into the very heart of hell. The historian* tells us how at Ciudad Rodrigo there had been drunkenness and plunder, and at Badajoz, in addition to these, lust and murder; but now, to all these was added devilish

* Napier's History, Vol. VI., p. 205.

cruelty—cruelty which staggers the mind by its enormous, incredible, indescribable barbarity.” (Vol. I., p. 371.)

But perhaps we are criticising with undue closeness the conduct of England toward other nations. It is true that in nothing else is England more prompt to administer uninvited advice and reproof to her neighbors than in regard to their dealings with each other; so that we may fairly test the value of the exhortation or rebuke, the suggestion of “what we ought to do,” or “what she would have done in our place,” by what she actually has done in like cases. But as the common speech of Englishmen indicates the conviction that they are still fitter to instruct every other nation of the earth upon questions of its own internal policy; that their own particular type of civilization is the highest and the completest yet known; and that this sublime social state is avouched, as it should be, by the crystalline purity of the governing class of men, as compared with the public men of other communities, we are tempted to see whether our officious neighbor’s eye is much freer from motes than our own.

Let us hasten to make certain large concessions in the outset. We admit that the English mind has now got hold, in an awkward way, of certain great principles of political economy, and is applying them in internal administration to an extent unhappily not equaled in any other country. It is true, and we are reminded of it whenever we look into an English periodical, that our own systems of taxation are oppressive and unproductive, or both, to a most disgraceful degree. It is no answer to say that this wasteful system has yet produced, from two-thirds of the country, in the first year after a devastating war, one hundred and sixty millions of surplus revenue; and that, on the other hand, in the eight years which followed the battle of Waterloo, the British debt was increased eleven millions sterling. We court such castigation; we kiss the rod; we rejoice in any persuasion which shall lead the American people to abandon efforts to raise itself by lifting at its waistband. We shall not even quote the date, not yet ancient, at which “the member for America,” as Cobden was called, accomplished the repeal of the corn laws. We grant that our financial condition is unsound, so long as we are afloat upon a sea

of irredeemable currency ; but we are emboldened to ask for a little more time to overcome that difficulty, when we learn from Miss Martineau that specie payments were resumed in England not until six years after the fall of Napoleon. Nor should it be wholly unnoticed that even in this financial state, which we admit to be unsound ; even while our kind neighbor was warning us that we were staggering upon the brink of financial ruin, and, stroking his protuberant waistcoat, was inviting us to learn from him the way to solid wealth and permanent solvency, he suddenly toppled over the precipice one fine day last spring, and was glad enough to lay hold upon the fifty millions of gold which, without greatly incommoding ourselves, we could spare him to scramble up by. Still we are ready, now that the theory seems to be discarded that our late war was waged solely in behalf of protection against the free trade South, to grant that our national enlightenment, upon politico-economical subjects, is no greater than that of the Chinese mind of to-day, or even the English mind of thirty years ago. But though it might be possible to parallel, from our own experience, the outcry with which Mr. Cobden's beneficent treaty of reciprocal trade with France was assailed in England only six years ago, neither record nor recollection would furnish a counterpart to the opposition, in both houses of Parliament, which, in 1816, would have denied to a company the privilege of lighting London streets with gas, on the ground of its unfavorable influence on the whale-fishery !

No less should it be acknowledged that our cousins have had cause, since the year 1834, for some glorification of their own goodness in freeing their planters' slaves, and some reprehension of our badness in not freeing our planters' slaves, though they could not well explain how we were to do the work ; nor will it be doubted that for thirty years they have made reasonably large use of their opportunities in that behalf. But while it was hardly possible to apply their remedy to our disease, it may be worth while, now that in our own rough way we have abolished slavery here, to observe the *sequela* of the cruel disease in their case, into which we may yet lapse. How close is the parallel between the conduct of slave owners and freedmen after peaceful emancipation in the

West Indies, and after violent emancipation in the United States, may best be seen in a few paragraphs which we will quote, and in writing which the historian might well have said to this nation,

"Mutato nomine, de te
Fabula narratur."

"It was then, and it ever will be, a matter of grateful surprise, that such an event as the abolition of slavery should have taken place amidst such quietness as prevailed throughout the West Indies. The quietness continued in most of the settlements; and no reasonable person can read the records of the time without emotions of admiration of the temper of the negroes during the critical years which succeeded their emancipation. While their conduct was such as to need no excuse, that of their former masters ought to have every allowance. * * * The Jamaica planters were now to decree in their Assembly, and to live under, a whole set of new laws which had never been necessary when all other men in their island had been their property, and not their neighbors; and it was most difficult for them and the imperial government to agree upon those laws. Again, many practices towards their negroes, while still in a state of apprenticeship, which appeared to them necessary and ordinary, could not be allowed under the new system; and the whipping of women, the cruel use of the treadmill, and many penal usages in prisons, were forbidden by imperial law, which appeared in the eyes of the planters mere favoritism to the negroes, and vexatious interference with themselves. * * * Their conduct was exactly what might have been expected,—that of children in a combative mood. The members of Assembly talked big, did provoking things, snubbed successive governors, used insolent language to the imperial government, endeavored to trench upon the Abolition Act by provisions in bills of their own, drew upon themselves disallowance of their acts from home, and then refused to provide for the executive wants of the island; and even hustled, and turned out of their house, the officer who came to deliver the Governor's message. After the completion of emancipation, a large proportion of the planters oppressed the patient negroes by arbitrary and illegal exactions of rent, by a misapplication of the vagrant law, and by all those harassing methods which suggest themselves to persons accustomed to despotism as a natural right, and thrown into ill-humor by a deprivation of that power." * * *

"Sir Lionel Smith was popular at first; and, during 1837, affairs proceeded with great smoothness. But the new governor was soon pronounced guilty of favoritism to the negroes, like everybody else who came from the mother country; and the insolence of the Assembly became more ostentatious than ever. It was prorogued, and then dissolved, under a stubborn refusal on its own part to pass the laws necessary for the transaction of the affairs of the colony. The new Assembly paraded a similar refusal as soon as it met,—in December, 1838. * * * The governor reported to the authorities at home that the laws were not clear in regard to the relations between the employing and the laboring classes, and that a complete new system was required. Under these circumstances,—with local legislation at a stand, and a large section of law requiring absolute renovation,—Lord Melbourne's government determined to propose to Parliament a suspension of the constitution of Jamaica for five years, during

which a provisional government would administer its affairs, allowing time for improvement in the temper of all the parties who were in a state of wrath." (Vol. IV., pp. 151-3.)

Here is history that is repeating itself day by day, on a larger scale, with us. Such was the vehemence of the controversy, that it turned the Melbourne ministry out of office. Certain far-sighted men "hoped that the cure might be naturally effected by means of the enlargement of the constituency of Jamaica which must take place henceforth through the admission of black citizens to political rights." If these statesmen could but have given larger effect to their policy, Jamaica might have been spared the horrors of last year's massacres. With us, these have been thus far but faintly imitated at Memphis and New Orleans; but their prototype, down to even the details of white men's atrocity, had occurred in Demerara in 1823. A circular from the home government, looking to the correction of certain abuses by slave-masters, had been sent to the different colonies. In Demerara,

"When the circular reached the colony, the members of the government and other gentlemen talked of it in the presence of their domestic slaves, without making express communications to the negroes on the subject of it, and even endeavoring to keep it secret from the field hands. * * * From what they heard from the house slaves, they naturally supposed that orders for their emancipation had arrived from England, and that they were to be defrauded of it. In most slave regions, this would have led to a massacre of the whites; and it no doubt would here, but for the influence of a missionary of the Independents, to whom the Episcopalian clergyman of the colony ascribes the whole merit of the fact that not a drop of the blood of white men was shed. This missionary, John Smith, had been in the colony for seven years, during which time he had trained his flock to habits of order, industry, submission, and peace. Under his care, marriage became almost universal; and not one marriage in fifty was violated. There was an extraordinary deficiency in religious ministers in this colony; and that one man could have effected what Mr. Smith did, shows what may be done by the calm and steady zeal of one man, whose single object is the improvement and happiness of his neighbors. Just before the changes caused by the circular, the Governor, whose object was 'to make head against the sectaries,' among whom he included all the religious bodies in the colony except the one Episcopalian flock,—even the Dutch and Scotch churches, as well as the Methodist and Independent missionaries,—had issued a prohibition to all the negroes to attend public worship, except by means of a pass from their owner, these owners being under no obligation to grant such a pass. When the slaves found themselves thus hindered in their worship, and believed themselves debarred from the liberty which the King had granted them, they rose upon their masters. They shed no blood; but they imprisoned the whites, and put some

in the stocks. * * * The rising took place on the 18th of August. On the 19th, martial law was proclaimed. On the 20th, the insurrection was completely over. While no white was sacrificed, about two hundred negroes were killed and wounded in the first instance; forty-seven were executed; and the floggings of many more were worse than death,—a thousand lashes being a frequent sentence. So much for the insurrection." (Vol. II., pp. 387-8.)

To complete the resemblance, this Independent missionary is judicially murdered, as the Baptist Gordon is murdered in Jamaica; his widow is forbidden to attend his midnight burial; and the poor enclosure with which his slave parishioners sought to mark his grave "torn down by official orders, and the place left desolate." Are all these things in store for us, too?

It is not a point of our plan to review the admirable exposition which Miss Martineau gives throughout her work of the condition of the lower classes of the English people, and their progress in comfort, intelligence, and morality, as the last twenty years of the peace succeed each other. Notwithstanding that progress, the inquiry would not be a pleasant one, though it might help us to understand some things in the character of the nation as a whole, and some things which characterize those upper strata of the nation, which cannot but take some color from the layers beneath them. When we read of the brutal populace which, until the new Poor Law in 1834, was wallowing yearly deeper in the mire; of its unheard-of crimes growing common and frequent; its professional murders for the supply of the dissecting-room; its rapid procreation of bastards for the sake of the parish allowance for infants; its murders by parents of whole families of children for the sake of the burial money; its facile poisonings; its torture of pauper apprentices; when we see how, under the old system, "industry, probity, purity, prudence,—all heart and spirit, the whole soul of goodness, were melting down into depravity and social ruin, like snow under the foul internal fires which precede the earthquake," we can hardly wonder that a British army should be the horror that it is; that there are Jamaica massacres, and Demerara massacres, and Sepoy blowings from guns; or that the tastes and amusements, and sometimes even the opinions, of decent Englishmen should have a certain taint

of brutality. Perhaps to this constant presence and contact may be attributed in part that constitution of mind which, in such men as Eldon and Ellenborough, would not hear of the slightest mitigation of a penal code incredible in its savageness. It seems like a caricature of history to read of the steady, inch by inch fight of the "conservatives" of forty years ago, against the innovations of Romilly. We see the House of Lords throwing out, session after session, such dangerous measures as the repeal of laws which punished with death the crimes of shop-lifting to the value of one dollar, and of stealing in a house to the value of ten dollars. We find Lord Chief Justice Ellenborough "lamenting that any attempts were made to change the established and well-known criminal law of the country, which had been found so well to answer the ends of justice;" and Lord Chancellor Eldon extolling "the wisdom of the principle and practice by which our criminal code was regulated;" while poor Romilly can only account for the "savage spirit" of his countrymen by the influence of the French Revolution. Verily, the good Huguenot blood in him must have been well Anglicised in two generations, or he might have observed that the horrors enacted into law before the French Revolution was dreamed of were abolished only as its influence began to be felt in the world. Then there are the same wise statesmen contesting, with some success, the abolishing of such parts of the punishment for high treason as provided for the vivisection of the convict before the multitude; Eldon foreboding danger to the constitution, if, after "taking away the cutting down alive and drawing, without a hurdle," the quartering after death were also abolished; so that to this day Her Majesty's subjects are held to their loyalty by the same fear of quadri-partition which has bound the empire together for so many centuries. Once, indeed, our author might have represented Eldon in the unwonted character of a reformer; when, in opposition to the protesting Common Council of London, and to the minority in Parliament, he assented to the abolition of "the people's great constitutional right" of "appeal of murder" and wager of battle. For it is almost in these our times, in the year of grace 1819, that that philosophical method of ascertaining truth was done

away with, after the judges of the King's Bench had been sadly puzzled by a demand for it by one accused of murder, and had been compelled to allow the demand, after full deliberation! The case is *Ashford vs. Thornton*, and is reported at great length, with the plea of the appellee: "Not guilty; and I am ready to defend the same by my body; and thereupon taking his glove off, he threw it upon the floor of the court;" and with the black-letter arguments of Chitty and Tindall, citing the "*Assises de Jérusalem*" and like works of jurisprudence, in 1 *Barnewall & Alderson*, pp. 405-461.

"'What a consistent career has Lord Eldon's been,' wrote a contemporary at this date; 'the ever active principle of evil in our political world! In the history of the universe, no man has the praise of having effected so much good for his fellow creatures as Lord Eldon has thwarted.'" (Vol. III., p. 89.)

Miss Martineau is not severe even upon Lord Eldon; and of public men in general she speaks with a commendable freedom from partisan rancor, if not with a judicial impartiality. We could have forgiven her indeed if she had seen fit to lay the lash of her scorn upon some of the politicians whom she has dealt with very gently, as vigorously as she could have castigated dishonest American or profligate French politicians. It is not to be expected that the earnest religious feeling of Wilberforce or Shaftesbury should meet with either sympathy or admiration in a person to whom religious feelings is apt to seem either an infirmity or an affectation; and we must not complain if Wilberforce is sneered at as a Sabbatarian, or Lord Ashley carped at as a one-sided humanitarian. Yet it would seem as if the notorious licentiousness of two premiers like Melbourne and Palmerston were as deserving as such infirmities of a woman's passing disapproval. We doubt, too, whether such moderate denunciation would have sufficed, if those ministers who purchased a prolonged tenure of power by the promise to their infamous King to obtain for him a divorce from his unhappy and outraged wife, had been, as we believe they could hardly have been, American instead of British statesmen. We are used to hearing that American social life is disfigured by impurity, while the example of a virtuous matron queen has expelled all that is unclean from English society; but we need not go far back in these volumes to learn

that it was within our times that the gross sons of George III. turned the Court of England into a sty. We are accustomed to endure the hardest sayings of the manners of our legislative bodies; no harder, however, than we daily utter ourselves; but we do not think that even when slave-holding ruffianism dishonored our capital, it presented scenes greatly worse than these:

"Mr. Brougham lost no time in taking out in full the license which he had of late, on the whole, denied himself, and on this night used language, and excited uproar, which deprived the opponents of parliamentary reform of their plea of the dignity and decorum of the House as then constituted. Some one having complained of a 'peculiar cry,'—whether a baa, a bray, or a grunt, Hansard does not say,—'a peculiar cry' which was heard amid the cheers of the House, Mr. Brougham observed, that, 'by a wonderful disposition of nature, every animal had its peculiar mode of expressing itself; and he was too much of a philosopher to quarrel with any of those modes.' And, presently after, he called up Sir Robert Peel to a personal altercation, by saying, after a reference to the Duke of Wellington, 'Him I accuse not. It is you I accuse,—his flatterers,—his mean, fawning parasites.' Such quarrels are always got rid of with more or less quibbling and ill-grace; but it should be noted that they did occur before the great opening of the representation which was now near at hand. Much was said by the enemies of parliamentary reform of the vulgarity of manners which would certainly show itself in the House when the manufacturing towns were represented; but at this time it was the complaint of strangers who attended the debates, that not only violence of language was occasionally very great, but that offensive noises,—the braying, baaing, crowing, mewing of animals—were ventured upon and tolerated in the House to an extent which would not be thought of in any other association assembled for grave purposes." (Vol. III., pp. 223-4.)

"In July, 1835, it was proposed, in the House of Commons, that accommodation should be provided in the new edifice for the presence of women at the debates. The proposal was made in a spirit and in language which went far to place every sensible woman on the same side of the question with Lord J. Russell, when he declared his disinclination to debate the matter, and his intention to oppose the motion. * * * The whole proceeding had much the air of an ill-bred joke,—the speech of the mover, the ostentatious eagerness to second it, the coarse mirth, and the large majority. On the next occasion, May 3, 1836, matters were worse,—the speeches more indecent, the mirth more flippant and unmanly, the majority larger in proportion. It seemed likely that the women of England might indeed be invited to be present at the deliberation of legislators whose method of invitation was an insult in itself, and who professed to wish for the presence of ladies, among other reasons, as a check upon intoxication and indecency of language. But the affair was happily put an end to by means chiefly of a serious and sensible reply from the speaker. * * * Whenever the time shall arrive when the legal position of woman in England comes fairly under the eye of the legislature, * * * it would be a serious disad-

vantage to Englishwomen to be judged of, as they inevitably would be, by such a sample as would have attended the debates on such an invitation as that of Mr. Grantley Berkeley and Mr. Villiers." * * * The House of Commons "had often expressed itself by the boyish passion and pot-house manners which had occasioned confusion within its walls; but it now outbid all former disgraces, and excited a disgust which was not likely to be forgotten. The simple-minded now knew something of the way in which some gentry talk when they get together,—like to like. The simple-minded were shocked; but they were glad to know the truth, and resolved to bear it in mind." (Vol. IV., pp. 74-6.)

During the debates on the corn-laws, "every personality that could pass the lips of educated men and gentlemen, in our period of civilization, was uttered by angry antagonists; and not a few which it is surprising that educated men and gentlemen could listen to without discountenance and rebuke. It would do no good to repeat any of them here." (Vol. IV., p. 521.)

When Englishmen have reproached us that our politics are ruled too much by the bowie-knife and pistol, some of us, conscious of the fact, have hardly known how to answer. The bitterest disgrace, probably, which ever fell upon our national character from the murderous acts of our public men, was the killing of one who had been a Secretary of the Treasury by one who had been Vice-President. We may almost congratulate ourselves therefore, that, violent as we are, and humane as our neighbors are, yet in a period beginning only two years before this century, no less than four British prime ministers, and those perhaps the most illustrious, have met antagonists with pistols in mortal combat. Nor need the complacency be all on one side, if we compare the honor in which Pitt, Wellington, Castlereagh, and Canning lived out the remainder of their lives and were sepulchered in the Abbey and St. Paul's, with the infamy which branded Aaron Burr as with the mark of Cain, and the thick cloud which darkened the career of every duelist who has sought promotion in our national politics.

The more deeply, in fact, whether by the aid of this history, or by exploring other sources, we scrutinize the public and private character of contemporary English statesmen, the less will be our superstitious reverence for them as elevated above the passions to which our own public men are subject. We need not deny that ours are often corrupt, oftener dishonest; nor that theirs are often pure and honorable; but our neighbors are not all white, any more than we are all black. Look at those citizens (we will take the crucial test) who in the two

countries have exercised the highest judicial functions. Among Lords Chancellors have been Westbury, by a vote of the House of Commons pronounced guilty of corruptly using his high office for the enriching of his relatives; Chelmsford, who had signalized himself while at the bar by so betraying, or unsuccessfully trying to betray, the interests of a client, that nothing but high rank and influence in England, and nothing in this country, would have saved him from being stricken from the rolls; Lyndhurst, who purchased the seals by a vulgar political apostasy; Brougham, whose defection from the liberalism he once professed, has since been only less total than that of Lord Lyndhurst, while his versatile incompetency for his office justified the sarcasm that "if Harry Brougham only knew a little equity law, he would know a little of everything;" Eldon, of whom we can hardly trust ourselves to speak. We protest against extolling the judicial glory even of these great names above those of Jay, of Marshall, of Washington, of Story, or even, descending to our State tribunals, the names of Parsons, Ellsworth, Kent, and Gibson. We must confess to a Taney; but we do so, remembering that the decision which has dishonored his name, and the names of a majority of his colleagues, was but the logical result of political and ethical ideas which had been from childhood a part of his moral nature; that it was the only stain on a splendid judicial character; and that the recorded opinions upon kindred subjects of an Eldon, an Ellenborough, and a Lyndhurst, give ample assurance that, had the opportunity been England's and not ours, hers and not ours would have been also the disgrace.

The limits to which we are restricted, no less than the feeling that we may be charged with a lack of charity, forbid our looking deeply into some of the enormities which Miss Martineau uncovers to us. We cannot examine the game-laws, their crushing burden upon agriculture, the monstrous cruelty of their administration, existing, nevertheless, at the moment in which we write; nor the notorious violence and impurity of elections, to which we are strangers here; nor the gusts of panic terror with which our staid cousins are now and then transported without a cause,—now a "Papal aggression" scare, now a "French invasion" scare,—but which they quickly for-

get when they wish to chide our excitableness. We cannot even reproduce her picture of that great ecclesiastical establishment, for our want of which we hear so much English condolence, and even some American regrets; of which the net revenues in 1831 were returned at three and a half millions sterling; and the influence of which in enlightening and Christianizing the people may be half guessed at from the paragraph which follows:—

“Without going over again the sickening record, found in the register of almost every year, of ignorance and fanaticism shown in disturbances requiring repression by soldiery, and punishment by the law, we may refer to one event which seemed to occur, as was said in Parliament, for the shaming of the Church. We find too much besides,—we find a rector of Lockington tithing the wages of a poor laborer, named Dodsworth, and throwing him into jail for the sum of four shillings and fourpence. We find church-rate riots abounding,—the paneling of pews broken in, and men exchanging blows in the church with fists and cudgels. We find revivals of religion taking place here and there,—scenes worthy only of a frantic heathenism,—scenes of raving, of blasphemous prayer, of panic-struck egotism, followed by burial processions to lay in the ground the victims of apoplexy or nervous exhaustion. We find men selling their wives in the market-places, with halters round their necks,—none of the parties having the remotest conception of what marriage is in the eye of the law, or of the Christian religion. We find crowds, in such a place as Sheffield, gutting, and repeatedly firing the Medical School, through the old prejudices against dissection. But all these incidents, and many others of like nature with them, wrought less on the public mind, to the shame of the Church, than an event which happened in 1838, almost under the shadow of Canterbury Cathedral. That in such a neighborhood a large body of the common people should believe a lunatic to be the Messiah, and follow him to death through such a series of observances as only a lunatic could have imposed, was a shock to the clergy, it was believed; and was certainly a subject of painful amazement to the rest of the world, which was not at all solicitous to keep its opinion to itself. From the House of Commons to the wayside inn, men were asking what the Church was for, and what the clergy could be about, if the population of a district near Canterbury could worship the wounds in the hands and side of a raving lunatic; see him fire a pistol at a star, and bring it down; believe him invulnerable, and themselves through him; expect to see him sail away, as he declared he came, on clouds of glory through the heavens; and, when he was shot dead, be quite happy in the certainty that he would rise again in a month.” (Vol. III., pp. 585-6.)

It would afford matter for a longer Article than this to review the opulent educational foundations of England, which include, in fact, the ecclesiastical funds themselves, and to see how their management and their present results will compare, for example, with the management by James Hillhouse of the

wild lands which were the basis of the Connecticut School Fund, and with the results which surround us. We should find two universities and a dozen or two of schools, where a few hundred young gentlemen are instructed from Horace and by their own experience that,

" *Ingenuas didicisse fideliter artes*
Emollit mores, nec sinit esse feros: "

which no one who has once seen the Pandemonium of an Oxford Commemoration could ever afterwards doubt. We should find these great establishments, not the sources from which light and learning are radiated to the ends of the earth, gladly communicating to all others, knowing that their own supply is never less, but the bitterest and stubbornest foes that light and freedom have ever had within the four seas; never failing to stone their prophets, if unwittingly they have produced them. No less than three times within forty years has the greatest statesman of each period been denied the cheap reward, so coveted by every English public man, of representing in Parliament the University at which all the three were trained; an honor which only fell to Lord Bacon late in his career, when, receiving the unprecedented distinction of a triple return, he elected to sit for the University of Cambridge, rather than for St. Albans, which gave him his title, or Ipswich, whose burgess he had been for thirteen years. In 1826, Canning, recounting in the House of Commons the sacrifices that witnessed his earnestness in the course of Catholic Emancipation, declares that the crowning one of all was the loss of that object before which all others vanished into comparative insignificance; which was desirable to him beyond all the blandishments of power, beyond all the rewards and favors of the crown; the honor of representing in that House the University of Oxford. Turning then to Mr. Peel, who sat beside him as member for that splendid constituency, he proceeded: "I rejoice with my right honorable friend in the high honor which he has obtained. Long may he enjoy the distinction; and long may it prove a source of reciprocal pride, to our parent university and to himself!" Three years from then Canning was gone. Peel was no longer the second, but the foremost statesman in the land. The confidence of the University in him had been founded on

his resistance to justice and freedom, as embodied in that Emancipation for the advocacy of which it had rejected Canning. Peel had now become too great and too wise longer to resist this great reform; and Oxford burned its idol on the same altar on which it had worshiped him. In 1865, the greatest English statesman was Gladstone; a man who, as is said of Peel, "was born into Conservatism, reared in it, and stationed to watch over and preserve it;" but like Peel, whose "mind and heart have kindled with an enthusiasm of which he was, twenty years ago, unsusceptible; an enthusiasm of popular sympathy, and in favor of a persuasive justice." And so, to mark symmetrically the relations of Oxford to enlightenment and progress, Gladstone is rejected, as Peel and Canning were rejected in their day. Three centuries ago, Oxford burned Cranmer, and Latimer, and Ridley, on the spot which now she has marked by a monumental shaft. How many years will it be (for even Oxford moves) before the polling-place of the University shall be graced by a new "Martyrs' Memorial," bearing the names of Canning, Peel, and Gladstone?

But we must have done. If we have said anything which seems either to express or to stimulate ill-will against the English people, we are sorry, for we have not meant it. If we are suspected of having unfairly reproduced the statements of the historian, we can only refer to the work itself as voucher for worse than we have said. But, with undiminished esteem for the grand virtues of many of our kinsmen beyond the ocean, we shall be well pleased if any timorous souls who have meekly submitted, as we have, to lingual castigation from English assumption, shall find in these volumes weapons with which to "strike back."

ARTICLE III.—THE POLITICAL PREACHING OF CHRIST
AND HIS APOSTLES.

*Letter from Judge J. S. Black on "Political Preaching," in
reply to Rev. Alfred Nevin, D. D. July 25th, 1866.*

JUDGE BLACK, of Pennsylvania, will be remembered by some of our readers as one of those unpleasantly distinguished men who a few years ago, in conjunction with a certain James Buchanan, undertook to carry on the Government of the United States. What a mess they made of it will not soon be forgotten, nor the fact that the style of their performance was determined in no small degree by the advice of Judge Black, who, as Attorney General of the Administration, assumed its guidance in constitutional and civil law. The Judge for the past few years has remained in obscurity, with no very strong prospect of being called to repeat his experiments in statesmanship; but being fully persuaded, like Micawber, that there is a field for his great talents somewhere, he has of late "broken out in a new place," and has addressed a series of letters to Rev. Dr. Nevin, upon the subject of political preaching, designed to establish the doctrine (perhaps as a sort of *apologia pro vita sua*) that religion has little or nothing to do with politics. We are so unfortunate as to have seen only one of these productions (that of July 25th, 1866), and perhaps do injustice to the rest when we say that we see no reason to believe that Dr. Nevin requires any assistance in the discussion. But not having met with any of the Rev. Doctor's replies, we infer, from the tenor of the paper before us, that his argument treats the subject upon general principles; and if this is so, he leaves open the way for us to present some views bearing upon the topic in controversy which are generally too much overlooked in similar discussions.

It is not our purpose to repeat the arguments by which the right and the duty of the preacher to defend the right and denounce the wrong, wherever they appear, in private morals, in

party platforms, or in public legislation, have been so often and so abundantly vindicated. The proposition laid down by Judge Black that "the clergy are without *authority*, as they are often without fitness, to decide for their congregations what is right or what is wrong in the legislation of the country," and that "they are not called or sent to propagate any *kind* of political doctrine," if it means anything at all, has been too often refuted to require the further attention of our readers.

We propose merely to examine one position of the Judge, which is frequently taken by the opponents of "political preaching," and which has not yet been so notoriously overthrown as to be totally destitute of influence.

Let us state the proposition in the words of Judge Black:—"Christ and his Apostles kept them [politics and religion] perfectly separate. They announced the great facts of the Gospel to each individual whom they addressed. * * * They expressed no preference for one form of government over another; they provoked no political revolutions, and they proposed no legal reforms. Had they done so, they would have flatly contradicted the declaration that Christ's kingdom is not of this world. * * * They joined in no clamors for or against any administration, but simply testified against *sin* before the only tribunal which Christ ever erected upon earth, that is to say the conscience of the sinner himself. The vice of political preaching was wholly unknown to the primitive church."

It is this historical assertion, so commonly and confidently uttered, that we propose to examine, and we design to inquire whether our Saviour and His Apostles did in fact so entirely abstain from all allusions of a political nature, and confine themselves so exclusively to spiritual exhortations, as it is the fashion to declare. We propose to show that both Christ and the Apostles not only preached freely and boldly upon such political questions as were connected with public morality, but even went beyond those limits, and "meddled" with various political and party questions of the day which had no moral or religious aspect whatever.

Let us first briefly review the political situation of the Jew-

ish nation, and some of the party disputes which agitated that people at the opening of the Christian era.

The Mosaic law was the "Constitution" of the State, whose whole internal and external administration and policy were regulated by its provisions. The Government was substantially an oligarchy or aristocracy, all political offices and all civil power and dignity being absorbed by the upper classes—the priests, scribes, and elders. This nobility or aristocracy was sufficiently numerous to be itself split up into parties or factions, each fiercely contending for the supremacy, their constant struggle being often attended by scenes of tumult and bloodshed. The leading parties of the State were the Pharisees and the Sadducees; the latter being, so to speak, the party of "strict constructionists of the Constitution," deprecating customs, laws, or observances not inculcated in that instrument, and the former insisting upon the validity and importance of numerous traditionary observances and laws which,—the accumulation of centuries,—were often frivolous, or opposed to the letter or spirit of the Mosaic Constitution. These questions of constitutional doctrine or construction furnished then as now the topics of party strife. They related for the most part to matters of belief or ceremonial observance in the Jewish religion (the "peculiar institution" of the State), which, as all State religions inevitably must, had come to be so identified and intermingled with secular considerations, parties, and politics, as to have substantially lost its spiritual character, and had come to be regarded in scarcely any other light than as a matter of public law. The questions discussed in connection with it, and upon which parties disputed, and often fought with bloody violence, were not as to what was *right* or *moral*, but as to what was *lawful*, and had as little connection with spiritual religion as those questions of a later period respecting the temporal supremacy of the Popes, or the divine right of kings, or the still more modern topics of temperance and slavery. Judge Black, recalling the evil effects of political preaching, describes the merely political character of similar controversies—the so called "religious wars" of Christian history, by saying: "There was nothing religious about them except that they were hissed up by the clergy. * * * It was the *poli-*

tics of the church, not her religion, that infuriated the parties, and converted men into demons. * * * The religious difference was a false pretence of the political preachers for the promotion of their own schemes."

The supreme legislative and judicial authority among the Jews was vested in the Sanhedrim or Senate. The members were elective, and its party complexion varied at different times, and over the assembly presided the High Priest, the Chief Magistrate of the nation. Beneath the aristocracy was the mass of the nation, "the common people," "the multitude," as they are called in the New Testament—who were completely under the influence and subjection of their rulers, but who, while yielding to the superior intelligence and authority of the aristocracy, yet viewed them with that mingled feeling of envy, jealousy, and hatred which such a form of government inevitably engenders.

Besides the leading political parties which we have mentioned, or rather within them, were various subordinate parties or factions, more or less affecting the political machinery of the State; and the situation was further complicated by the external relations of the nation. The country having just been conquered by the Romans was held by them as a province, a sort of military bureau being established in it, and its native government, tolerated for the time, being liable to be abolished at any moment. Accordingly, the national authorities and the leading politicians, being in constant apprehension that some rigid "policy of reconstruction" might be applied by the conquerors if occasion should provoke it, were, with a prudence that might well be imitated in similar cases, exceedingly conservative in all their views, and deprecated popular agitations and demonstrations of every kind, having especial dislike of popular orators, "fire-eaters," and haranguers, of whom not a few came forward to alarm them. In this they had the sympathy of the Herodian party, or supporters of the Herodian family, the reigning family of Judea under "the Constitution as it was," and who, as the regular office-holders of the nation, naturally sought to propitiate the conqueror by sustaining his "policy," whatever it might be for the moment, in order if possible to retain or recover their official positions. The peo-

ple on the other hand, full of patriotism and national prejudice, brave and excitable in their character, chafed under the foreign yoke, and were ever ready to crowd around any popular leader who dared publicly to express the general hatred of the Roman. This tendency was stimulated at this epoch by the conviction, shared in common by people and rulers, that the Messiah, the National Deliverer, was about to appear. Hence, the legal authorities, as anxious as the people for national independence, covertly listened to every new leader for a time, in the secret hope that each might prove to be "the coming man," but not daring to commit themselves or appear to encourage him till they should be able to judge of his true character and probable success. An illustration of this uncertain feeling is found in the speech of Gamaliel to the Sanhedrim (Acts v., 34, 39), in which he alludes to the fate of several political pretenders of considerable promise who had "perished," and advises that the new movement of the Apostles be neither opposed or encouraged, since "if it be of man, it will come to naught; but if of God, ye cannot overthrow it, lest haply ye be found to fight against God."

It was in this condition of parties and politics, that Christ appeared among the people teaching and preaching. John the Baptist had preceded him, creating the excitement that had always attended popular agitators, and was now in prison, the sure receptacle at last of all that class. His "movement," it was thought, was over, and the new teacher quickly engrossed the public attention. The populace, always ready and eager for the coming Deliverer, thronged about his steps, looking for words of political direction and encouragement. The legal authorities on the other hand—"the Chief Priests, Rulers, and Scribes, and the Elders of the people"—though sharing in the popular interest, were more jealous and circumspect, and simply watched him closely. They soon discovered that he was not the man for their affiliation or support, and their dissatisfaction at the dangerous popular excitement which he was creating was increased to a personal dislike, growing to rancorous hatred, when they found him holding up their own hypocrisy, tyranny, and crimes to the public reproach. Thus though differing among themselves upon almost all other questions,

they mutually agreed in this, that Jesus must be put down. The difficulty was that with the masses he was universally and overwhelmingly popular, and among these all party feuds were forgotten in the general reverence and devotion to the new leader. Violent measures against him among a populace so excitable as the Jews would be dangerous. A deeper policy was adopted, in which all parties among the aristocracy combined. It was arranged that prominent and influential politicians from all parties should follow him about, and besides watching his language for sentiments or expressions calculated to offend any partisan or national prejudices of the people, should also, as opportunity offered, suggest for his solution some of the different party questions which divided the nation. This was to be done so shrewdly, that Jesus should be led to "define his position" upon all of them in turn, thus in time of fending and alienating many or all of his hearers through the influence of their party sympathies. Such were the "tempting questions" that were put to him by the representatives of the different parties in turn—Pharisees, Sadducees, Herodians, &c.,—almost invariably of a party nature, and framed and designed to commit him upon these disputed points in such a manner "that they might catch him in his words."

The plot and its purpose were of course perfectly understood by our Lord, "who knew what was in man, and needed not that any should tell him;" and it would have been easy for him to defeat it by evasive answers, or by openly declining to discuss any political or party question whatever, even those more or less remotely connected with moral principles, and especially any relating to ceremonial observances or doctrinal quibbles, matters which he did not hesitate to declare to be things of comparative indifference. Indeed to the eye of that worldly wisdom which considers "prudence" the first duty of the pulpit, and "so preaching the Lord as not to offend the Devil," there were strong reasons for such avoidance. His doctrine was taking root in the popular heart. By shunning "political preaching" entirely, by evading party jealousy, by insisting in the sense in which his words are quoted by Judge Black—"My kingdom is not of this world;" I come to teach spiritual truth, and leave party conflicts to be settled in their appro-

priate arena—he would probably escape the snares that were set for him, and secure the effect of his Gospel until its doctrines should be ineradicably established in the public mind. That accomplished—our critics would have urged—and Christianity universally accepted, its teachers might safely cope with party disputes, at least with such as turned upon strictly moral topics, and settle them upon correct principles. But for a new religion just struggling into existence to “mix itself up with politics,” would be inevitably fatal to its success, and destructive to the influence if not the lives of its preachers. Such delicate philosophy, however, did not enter into Christ’s view of his mission. He had no such refined theories about defiling “spiritual religion,” by expressing an interest in the practical concerns of life. Openly avowing that he had not come to smooth over or destroy differences of opinion, to ignore the existence of parties, to feebly conceal the truth in order to avoid the criticism of its offended betrayers, not to bring peace upon earth but a sword, he in almost every case promptly met the issue presented, and fearless of party jealousy, unequivocally committed himself to its true solution. Scarcely a single instance can be found where he distinctly evaded a question of party difference or dispute, while several are on record, not of a party nature, which he did not meet with a decisive answer. Of this kind, were questions relating to his own personal claims or character—the question whether *he* would pronounce a different judgment for adultery than the law of Moses prescribed—by what authority he preached and wrought miracles—whether he recognized his obligation as a Jew to pay the voluntary religious tribute of the people, and others that might be mentioned. But it will be difficult to find, among the “tempting questions” of public or party interest that were presented, a single one upon which he did not distinctly take a decided position.

Let us particularize. A standing question of party difference is put to him by the Pharisees, “tempting him” (in other words, *as a party question*), to get him committed. “Is it lawful [constitutional] for a man to put away his wife for every cause?” (Matt. 19, 3). In the terrible state of morals which prevailed in that degraded age and country, this was regarded

as a question of constitutional law about as nearly connected with religion as some of the legal points relating to "woman's rights" are considered by us at the present day. By the strict letter of the Mosaic law, it could not be denied that a wide latitude was permitted to the husband, and to the conservatives of the day (especially the married ones) this was enough. Here was a constitutional guaranty that ought not to be disturbed, and could not be without an unwarrantable interference with private rights, and with the sacred and time honored institutions of the nation. It was therefore a dangerous topic to discuss, but it was frankly treated by the Great Teacher. Not so fearful as Judge Black represents him about "proposing legal reforms," he boldly declares that the "constitutional compromise" of Moses, being inconsistent with "the higher law," was always void, and at that day especially must be set aside as totally behind the age. "Moses for the hardness of your hearts suffered you to do so, but from the beginning it was not so, and I say unto you, that whosoever justifying himself by his reverence for the Constitution as being 'good enough for him,' perpetrates a wrong against his fellow-being, commits a *crime* for which God will hold him accountable." In a similar spirit, when his disciples, by eating with unwashed hands, by plucking corn and carrying burdens on the Sabbath day, clearly violated the Mosaic law, as expounded by the courts of the nation and universally accepted by the people (Mark vii. 3), he asserted that such constructions were not to be regarded as authoritative, whenever they came in conflict with man's duty to himself or others.

And not only did Jesus thus unhesitatingly oppose himself in his public discourses to the judicial authority and the popular prejudice, but in the public acts and conduct by which he accompanied and illustrated his preaching he did not shrink from giving still greater offense to class and party jealousy. In no country—not even in our own Southern States—has there ever existed a greater antipathy to a degraded race, than prevailed among the Jews toward the publicans. This designation is applied in the New Testament to those Jews who gave their services to the foreign invader for the extraction of tribute from their countrymen. "The taxes thus imposed and collected, were regarded," says Kitto, "with disgust and impatient abhor-

rence as badges of the national dishonor, and those Jews who made themselves the instruments of this disgrace to their country were accounted the vilest of the vile, the scum and offscouring of the earth. They became, in fact, outcasts from all society, except that of their own degraded class. No decent man would partake of their food, entertain them at his own table, or enter their houses. They were not allowed to enter the synagogues or the temple, or to take any part in public prayers. No offerings from them were ever accepted at the temple; they were not allowed to hold any office, even the lowest, in the courts of judicature, and in those courts their testimony was not allowed in any causes," &c. Of course this hatred toward the ostracised class was returned by it with equal bitterness, and thus a party feeling of the most intense character existed. Nothing could give greater offense to the political sentiments of all patriotic Jews, or be looked upon as more expressive of party affiliation than the association by Christ with members of this class on familiar and friendly terms. It was not only in the public estimation a species of degrading "amalgamation," but it was hardly less than a misdemeanor in the eye of strict law. Yet Jesus not only persistently defied this class and partisan prejudice in his conduct and his preaching, but, with a courage only paralleled by that of the modern clergyman who invites a negro into his pulpit, selected one of his disciples (Matthew the publican) from among them, and commissioned him to preach the gospel to his countrymen.

Next to the Publicans, the Gentiles were despised and hated by the Jewish people. By universal consent, and by constitutional law, they were excluded from all political privileges or sympathies. They were entitled to no consideration from "the seed of Abraham," and had, so to speak, "no rights which a Jew was bound to respect." What then must have been the indignation, not only of the lawyers and scribes, but of the common people to hear Jesus in his public discourses to mingled audiences of Jews and Gentiles proclaim that "many shall come from the East and the West and sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of Heaven, while the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into outer darkness!" Again and again did Jesus repeat these

political heresies, to the disgust of nine-tenths of his hearers, who, with the same zeal as that with which we insist that "ours is a white man's government," maintained that by the Abrahamic covenant, God was limited to a strictly Jewish policy, under which none but Jews could be recognized as having "natural and inalienable rights." As often, therefore, as Jesus asserted his objectionable doctrines of "Gentile equality," did they angrily protest against them. In the eighth chapter of John is reported a long and exciting discussion between Christ and the Jews on this subject, in which Jesus insisted that they were Abraham's seed who did the works of Abraham; to whatever class, people, or race they belonged by natural descent. This was equivalent to preaching that "a Gentile was as good as a Jew, if he behaved himself as well," and that the word "Jew" must be struck out of the Hebrew constitution of exclusive citizenship. Jesus, indeed, insisted upon these odious political views so uniformly and frequently that he was evidently regarded in consequence by the Jewish public as a fanatic with regard to them—a man of one idea—a radical, and an agitator. In the very outset of his career, and in his first pulpit effort he broached his peculiar views, reminding his hearers that Naaman the Syrian, and the widow of Sarepta, though not Jews, were recognized by God in the light of Jewish citizens; and the effect of this ultra-political preaching was the same upon this as upon every repetition of it—all who heard it being "filled with wrath," rising up and thrusting him out of the city—with an endeavor to take his life.* No such excitement ever followed his inculcation of merely "spiritual re-

* Probably addressing him in language much like the following, quoted from Judge Black's letter:—"The use of the clerical office for the purpose of promulgating political tenets under any circumstances or with any excuse is in my judgment not only without authority, but is the highest crime that can be committed against the government of God or man. In the first place it is grossly dishonest. I employ you as a minister, pay your salary, and build you a church because I have confidence in your theological doctrines. * * * Now you are guilty of a base fraud, if, instead of preaching religion, you take advantage of the position I have given you to ventilate your crude and ignorant notions on State affairs. I have asked you for bread and you have given me a stone; instead of the fish I bargained for, you put into my hands a serpent that stings and poisons me."

ligion," a circumstance which, in the view of his conservative contemporaries, seemed doubtless a sufficient proof that he had better confine himself to the latter, as his more legitimate province.

The utterances of Christ which we have noticed, were such as were at variance with the general view, and it may possibly be insisted that that political preaching which has *no* sympathizers is less objectionable than that which coincides with the sentiments of at least half the public. Let us, therefore, look at some of his political discourses which, being leveled at the political position and influence of a portion of his hearers, were exceedingly obnoxious to that part, and proportionally gratifying to the rest of his audience. We have alluded to the mutual jealousy that subsisted among the Jews between the aristocracy and the plebeian classes. Evidence and illustration of this enmity are everywhere found in the Evangelists. Thus we read that "the scribes and Pharisees hated his doctrine," and "were sore displeased at his doings," but "the common people heard him gladly," (or "delightedly"), an expression which by its connection has evident reference to the reciprocal jealousy between the classes. The elders and rulers were infuriated at his success with the multitude. They exclaimed with intense bitterness, "Have any of the Scribes and Pharisees believed on him? but this *people* which knoweth not the law ~~are~~ cursed," or more exactly, "this miserable, ignorant rabble are not fit to live." The aristocracy and the rulers were constantly scheming to take his life, "but feared *the people*," who though frequently offended by Christ's heresy on the Gentile question, yet revered him as their personal friend and benefactor, and scarcely less, as their champion against the tyranny of the upper classes. What more intensely political preaching* can be found, or what more calculated to excite political animosities among its hearers, than those public discourses of Christ, in which he holds up before the multitude the offenses and follies of the aristocracy, their arrogance—

* "The political preacher," says Judge Black, "directs the attention of his hearers away from their own sins to the sins, real or imputed, of other people." And again, "a political preacher speaks to one community, one party, or one sect, and his theme is the wickedness of another."

their oppressions—their personal and political vices and crimes! “Beware of the leaven of the Scribes and Pharisees!” Be not as the hypocrites are, who make broad their phylacteries—who make clean the outside of the cup and platter, but inside are full of uncleanness. “The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’ seat, therefore whatsoever they command you, do—but do not after their works!” &c. Were a modern preacher to inveigh against the administration and its officers in a similar manner he would be met with advice like this—“Your course is neither prudent nor proper! Whatever may be the personal or political character of our rulers, you must remember that they are in the high places of the nation, and accord them the respect due to their position and office. By this public denunciation you not only irritate, and thus retard reform, but you are inflaming the political jealousies and hatreds of the lower classes, too prone at all times to speak evil of dignities. But if you *will* preach politics, at least do so without direct attacks and allusions. If these men are hypocrites, preach against hypocrisy in the abstract; if they are oppressors or extortioners, or corrupt, take topics like the tyranny of Pharaoh, or the greed and punishment of Achan. Then let the audience make the application, and you will accomplish more good, and incur less censure.” Far different from this was the style of preaching practised by Jesus. His attacks upon the private and public sins of the aristocracy were direct and scathing, nor did he hesitate to contrast them personally with the most despised and degraded portions of his audience: “Behold, I say unto you, the publicans and the harlots shall go into the kingdom of God before you!” And again, in the parable of the Pharisee and the publican, contrasting the arrogant assumption of the noble with the humility of his social inferior, he pronounces a moral which must have been received with mingled “cheers” and “hisses” by his audience,—“I say unto you that whoso exalteth himself shall be abased, and every one that humbleth himself shall be exalted.”

But it was not merely the personal character and social pretensions of the aristocracy that Christ laid bare to the popular odium. He charges home upon them serious political offenses—betrayals of their official trust as rulers of the nation—crimes

against the law and the Constitution, and wrongs against the people in political corruption, oppression and extortion. He turns upon "the lawyers" and "the scribes," the official expounders of the Constitution and framers of the public laws—the members of the Legislature, the Judges of the Courts, and the Attorney-Generals of the Administration—and charges them with maintaining and enforcing enactments totally adverse to the spirit and even the letter of the Constitution—laws which they compelled others to obey, but violated themselves—made and maintained for the purposes of extortion and tyranny: "Ye lade men with burdens, heavy and grievous to be borne, but which ye touch not yourselves with one of your fingers." He charges them with willfully perverting and obscuring the public law for their own advantage: "Ye have taken away the key of knowledge, and them that would have entered in, ye have hindered;"—with judicial tyranny and corruption: "Ye tithe mint, anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and truth;"—with oppression and extortion: "Ye devour widows' houses;"—with forced and false constructions of constitutional law:—"Ye blind guides, which say whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing, but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple he is a debtor:"—and closes with a powerful thrust at their disapprobation of political preaching, which had probably been unmistakably manifested during the progress of this sermon;—"Woe unto you!" he exclaims, "who say, if we had been in the days of our fathers we would not have been partakers with them of the blood of the prophets,"—those political preachers of an earlier period; "but ye are witnesses unto yourselves that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets; for behold I send unto you prophets," [not foretellers of future events—but *out-speakers*—denouncers of public sins—political preachers], "and wise men and scribes, whom ye will persecute and kill, and whose blood shall be upon your heads! Ye serpents! ye generation of vipers! how shall ye escape the damnation of hell?" It is not surprising to read, after this unequivocal language, that the Scribes and Pharisees "began to urge him vehemently;" but being afraid to proceed to open violence against an orator so

strongly in sympathy with the people, they adopted the more crafty mode of "provoking him to speak of many things, laying in wait for him, and seeking to catch something out of his mouth that they might accuse him." In other words, they marked and laid up for future use expressions that might damage his popularity with the multitude;—not precepts of morality, or exhortations to spiritual religion—these could not injure him,—but remarks or language of partisan interest or bearing, tending to offend the party prejudices of some or other of his hearers.

That the "many things" of which his aristocratic enemies "provoked him to speak" were of this partisan nature, and had, in some cases at least, no direct connection with moral or religious doctrine, may be inferred from the account given by the Evangelists of one of the most important of the interviews that were pre-arranged to entrap him. Committees had been selected from the cunning politicians who represented the different parties of the nation, which were to present to him in turn such "tempting questions" as it would be impossible for him to answer without offense to a portion of his audience. The scheme was precisely the same as is often pursued in our own day, to "kill off" a dangerous candidate, by inducing him to "define his position" upon some delicate party topic. Jesus, of course, fully comprehended the purpose, and might easily have evaded it by silence, or non-committal answers; but as the questions were such as had more or less of practical importance, he did not shrink from a frank avowal of his sentiments, couching his answers, however, in the form of arguments so conclusive that his confounded questioners could only "marvel at him, and go their way."

The account of this interview is given by the three Evangelists—Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in almost the same language. Three questions were presented for solution to Jesus, and we propose to take them in their order. The first, and the one most frequently cited, especially by the opponents of political preaching as affording a case of evasion by Christ, and thereby a rebuke of political preachers, was put to him by a joint committee of Pharisees and Herodians. They came to him "tempting him," and inquired, "Is it lawful for us to

give tribute unto Cæsar or not? Tell us, shall we give, or shall we not give?" Only a short time previously Judas of Galilee (the same referred to in the speech of Gamaliel, Acts v. 36) had "risen up in the days of the taxing, and drawn much people after him," by insisting that it was contrary to Jewish constitutional law for any of that nation to pay tribute to a foreign power. The doctrine had been made the principal plank in the platform of an immense party, and an insurrection had been based upon it. The rebellion had been speedily crushed, and "Judas had perished and come to naught," but his doctrine was still extremely popular, and no leading politician would dare openly to denounce it. The Pharisees accordingly, while not daring to offend the Roman power by openly countenancing such views, could not, as Jews, otherwise than deeply sympathize with their countrymen. The boldest attitude therefore that they ventured to take in regard to the question was similar to that of Mr. Douglas on slavery, viz., to neither vote the tribute up nor vote it down, but leave the people perfectly free to act with regard to it just as they pleased, and settle their own affairs in their own way. The Herodians, on the other hand, whose success as office seekers depended so largely upon supporting the "policy" of the Roman "reconstructionists," boisterously maintained (with whatever of secret disgust) the extreme doctrine of submission to the Executive and office dispensing power. In the presence of a vast multitude, comprising the adherents of all these political views, Jesus was called upon to define his position upon this most delicate and exciting political question.

It was a question which a timid or compromising preacher would have found it easy to evade by declaring that the Gospel had nothing to do with politics. But the Great Teacher saw that more harm than good would come from shirking a question of such practical interest, though unconnected with morals or spiritual religion. There was a true answer to it, and only dishonesty or cowardice could blink the point, or pretend to consider it a doubtful one. He accepted the issue, and while rebuking the hypocrisy which covered the inquiry, he gave it a frank and conclusive decision. "Why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites! Show me the tribute money. Whose image

and title are borne by this the current coin of the country as its sovereign?" They say unto him, "Cæsar's:" and then with unanswerable argument he replies—"Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's." In other words, "While Cæsar is your acknowledged political sovereign, it is your duty to pay the taxes which are incident to his rule. There is nothing in this unlawful or inconsistent with your obligations to God and his appointed service. Do your whole duty both to Cæsar your temporal sovereign, and to God your spiritual ruler, and make no pretence of incompatibility to excuse the wrongful neglect of your obligations to either!" So far from this reply being evasive, it is a political sermon of the most positive kind, and must have been so understood by his hearers. It is certain that commentators, so far as we know, have no disagreement regarding the purport of the passage.

The question of the Herodians being thus disposed of, and in a manner that must have gratified them and the Pharisees as being likely to diminish Christ's popularity with the multitude—a committee from the Sadducean party present themselves with their party shibboleth. Their question relating to the woman who had had seven husbands—"Whose wife of them all shall she be in the resurrection?"—was one that did not directly raise the issue of the resurrection of the dead over which parties quarreled. It rather related to the future social relations of disembodied spirits, and is so treated by Christ who answers it completely, by declaring that such "neither marry nor are given in marriage." Having thus baffled their purpose, however, he would not suffer his hearers to suppose that he would shirk a question of such momentous importance as that of the resurrection, however it might be "mixed up with party politics." He therefore takes up the subject himself where he had dropped it. "But as touching the resurrection of the dead," &c.—and confounds them so completely upon the point that "the multitude are astonished," and the Sadducees "put to silence."

The applause of the people at this demolition of the Sadducean platform immediately caused a buzzing among the Pharisees, who feared that his victory would weaken the effect

of his unpopular remark on the tribute; and they determined to proffer him, then and there, another vexed question of party dispute for his solution. The question "Which is the greatest commandment of the law?" might seem to us one of mere casuistry, had we not in our own day seen violent party controversy upon not dissimilar issues. The questions, "In a conflict of constitutional requirements, which is paramount?" "Is a man's conscience more binding than his constitutional obligations?"—or even this, "Is a man's highest allegiance due to his State or to the nation?" all of which are forbidden topics for the preacher, correspond very nearly with the one now presented to Jesus. As ordinarily treated, it was a question of mere casuistry, and of no practical importance, and presented nothing but a matter of party catchwords and frivolous disputation. Some of the disputants were accustomed to maintain that all parts of the law, even the most trivial, were of equal importance and force, and that to elevate one was to cast disrespect on the rest. Others maintained that some of its requirements were of greater weight than others; and here came in a difference of opinion in the selection of the most important in point of dignity, or of binding force, in case of a conflict of duties. Christ answers the question decisively, but gives the subject by his reply a different form from that in which it is presented by the inquiry—a form in which it assumes not only a practical and valuable shape, but demonstrates the truth of his answer. He declares that the law's commands are properly reduced to two—the one enjoining the love of God, the other the love of man; that both are of equal obligation, but that the former being fundamental takes precedence of the other, the latter being, so to speak, only supplementary of it. Duty to God, therefore, constitutes the highest class of human obligations, and studiously cultivated ensures the observance of all others. No one seems to have thought of "tempting" Jesus with the question found so difficult of decision in modern times, whether a man should obey his conscientious convictions of duty or not, when they are in conflict with human law? His answer to such a question, had it been presented, may be pretty clearly inferred from his remark upon another occasion: "Fear not them that kill the

body, but rather fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in Hell! Yea, I say unto you, fear Him?"

After this last reply, the Pharisees felt disinclined to pursue the catechising further. They had gained no advantage except in the question about the tribute. In his other replies, Jesus had effaced somewhat the bad impression that his first answer had made with the multitude. They preferred to let the matter stand where it was, especially as no one dared further to expose himself to discomfiture in public, and to the derision of the crowd which accompanied it. Then Jesus turning, "spake to the multitude and to his disciples" in that withering denunciation of the aristocracy already quoted. Well understanding the purpose of his questioners, he referred to their murderous purpose, and its approaching success, to the preachers whom he should send forth to persecution and to death, and predicted the awful retribution that Jerusalem and the Jewish nation were to suffer for such political crimes. He was well aware that the object of the conspiracy had been substantially attained; that, by committing himself so frankly upon party themes, he had disaffected many of his hearers, and that his influence, now at its height, was about to wane. In the words of Kitto, relating to this occasion and its results—"Many still wavered, many were still willing to adhere to him on any terms, but taking the people in the mass, it is here we would place the commencement of that reaction in the public enthusiasm, which was soon to be attended with the most awful results."

A marked case of political preaching, and of that ultra-obnoxious sort which has been termed "sectional preaching," occurs in the discourse of Christ to the woman of Samaria. The animosity between the Jews and Samaritans was purely sectional and was exceedingly bitter. The remark of the Evangelist that "the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans," falls far short of expressing its intensity, since there was a violent hatred between the communities, often breaking out in tumult and bloodshed. The quarrel arose from sectional jealousies intermingled with a prejudice of race, there being about as much difference of ancestry between the two parties as between the South Carolina or Virginia "chivalry" and the

New England "Yankees." Their controversy related to the respective claims of Mount Gerizim and Jerusalem to be the religious capital of the nation. Christ emphatically declares that this party issue is of no importance either in principle or in practice. He says, "The hour cometh, and *now is*, when neither in Jerusalem nor in this mountain shall men worship the Father," and he might therefore have naturally and properly declined to express any opinion upon this useless question between the sections. Yet there being a right and a wrong answer, and having been distinctly called upon to decide the issue, he does not hesitate to do so in favor of the Jewish claim, and then passes on immediately to topics of more practical value. "Ye worship ye know not what—we know what we worship, for salvation is of the Jews." Neither Garrison or Philips could utter anything in South Carolina more offensive, politically, than this declaration in Samaria, yet it would seem that far greater liberty of opinion and of speech was tolerated in Shechem than in Charleston, for the people not only heard him gladly, but "besought him to tarry with them many days." At another time and place, and before a Jewish audience, Christ stirred up this same sectional feeling on their part by his parable of the Good Samaritan, in which he drew a striking and uncomplimentary contrast between the most honored and venerated of their own "chivalry," and one of the despised and hated of the inhabitants of Samaria. Its moral was: "Even a Samaritan may justly inquire, 'Am I not a man and a brother?' for despised as he is by the meanest of you, in your assumed superiority of race and caste, he is worthy of more respect than the best of you all when he behaves in a more manly way." It is not difficult to see that such preaching would be regarded as likely "to stir up disaffection" among the Samaritans, and so as highly incendiary and exceedingly reprehensible in its character.

From political preaching we pass on to a more remarkable and impressive style of "agitation" which was employed by Christ on two celebrated occasions. The first case is that of his sending the devils in Gergasene into a herd of swine, thereby causing the destruction of a large amount of valuable property; and the other is that of his expelling the brokers and mer-

chants from the Temple, with what was probably termed "mob violence" by the victims. In both these cases, there was no illegality in the occupations interfered with. The eating of swine was prohibited to the Jews as a ceremonial restriction merely. The prohibition did not apply to the Gentiles, even by Mosaic law, and thus the keeping of swine by Gentiles, or by Jews for the use of Gentiles (who composed the principal part of the population in "the country of the Gadaraes"), was no violation of Jewish law. Moreover, it is certain that Christ did not regard the sale or eating of swine as an offense against general morality—at least the whole Christian world have always practiced upon that supposition. What he designed to do in sending the devils into the herd was probably to rebuke an occupation on the part of Jews which tended to weaken their reverence for the national laws and institutions, even if confined within the limits of strict legality; and probably the theory of his procedure was precisely that asserted by the fanatical "Maine-Law" politicians a few years since, that the destruction of property kept *for illegal purposes* was no invasion of property rights. But upon whatever ground his action is to be explained, it certainly excited as much astonishment and indignation in that vicinity as a Maine law destruction of liquor "in the original packages" would at the Five Points—or the stampede of Maryland slaves by Rev. Charles Torrey did a few years ago in Baltimore. It was regarded as an unwarrantable interference with the rights and laws of private property, and "the whole city," which was doubtless largely interested in the pork trade, at once came out in a panic, "and besought him to leave their coasts." The overwhelming public sentiment was against such "fanaticism," and he retired before its expression, to visit that region no more.

In his conduct at the Temple, too, at the head of the vast multitude who followed, applauding his acts and overawing resistance, he was breaking up a business which was regarded as perfectly lawful and legitimate, and which had the sanction and approval of the legal authorities. Nor did Christ himself deny its legality. He seems rather to have designed the expulsion as a rebuke of the *mode* in which the occupations

were conducted—of the cheating and extortions—the indecent chaffering and clamor by which the traders habitually disgraced the sacred precincts, and perhaps also of corrupt participations by the priesthood in the fraudulent gains of the traders. Doubtless it was so understood by the multitude, who were the constant victims of these extortions and knaveries, and who therefore viewed the discomfiture of the hucksters with a tolerance which they might not otherwise have displayed at such a procedure. These proceedings of Christ were in fact not very unlike the course of a modern clergyman, who, after preaching a sermon on temperance, should march forth to the licensed liquor shops of the town, and break in the heads of the rum-barrels; or who, after denouncing the sin of slavery, should proceed to liberate by force a fugitive held in legal custody for transmission to his master.* The indignation of the legal authorities was intense. We read that “the chief priests and scribes were sore displeased”—a chronic displeasure—the same that agitators in all ages encounter. In their rage and despair, they called on him for his authority. “By what authority doest thou these things?” “Who gave thee authority to do these things?” By what right do you, who pretend to be a religious teacher, engage in these secular proceedings? Is your commission from Heaven or of men? Are you really a preacher of righteousness, or only a “scurvy politician”?† Christ treated the demand with small respect. “My commission is of the same kind as John’s, that political preacher whom Herod slew for criticising ‘his policy.’ Tell me if his was from Heaven, and I will satisfy

* “If drunkenness be a sin of your congregation, you may warn them against it. * * * But your position gives you no authority to provoke violent hostilities against tavern keepers, liquor dealers, or distillers. * * * If slavery be a practical question in your church, [you may teach the truth respecting it,] but what precept can you show for inciting servile insurrection? Who gave you the right to say that John Brown was better than any other thief or murderer, merely because his crimes were committed against pro-slavery men.”—*Judge Black’s Letter.*

† “A Christian minister has no authority to preach upon any subjects except those in which divine revelation has given him an infallible rule of faith and practice. * * * When he does more than this, he goes beyond his commission—he becomes a scurvy politician.”—*Judge Black’s Letter.*

you about mine;”—an answer that baffled their wrath and silenced further inquiry.

Without pursuing farther the citation of instances in which Christ in his preaching touched upon the political or party prejudices of the people, we will call attention to the fact that he was regarded by the Jews themselves as a political preacher and agitator. In the Cabinet councils of the administration, the political effect of his course was that which was specially feared; “The Romans shall come and take away our place and our nation!” And Caiaphas, the Chief Magistrate, advised that he be put out of the way, upon the ground that it was “better that one man should die for the people and the whole nation perish not.” This agitation must end in the dissolution of the Jewish Government and nationality. It must therefore be put down, and they accordingly “took counsel to slay him.” So too the charge against him before Pilate was political preaching. “He perverteth the nation” from its political allegiance. “He stirreth up the nation.” “He forbiddeth to give tribute to Cæsar.” And when Pilate hesitated to destroy him upon such general charges, they cried out: “If thou let this man go, thou art not Cæsar’s friend; he that maketh himself a king, speaketh against Cæsar?” Christ’s kingdom was well understood by his accusers to be “not of this world”—a spiritual kingdom only—but, like other sticklers for spiritual preaching undesecrated by politics, they hooted, as treason to the government, any intimation of a kingdom or law higher than that of the land. To insist upon primary allegiance to God, they cried, is speaking against Cæsar; and then followed the clamorous shout, as sincere in the mouths of the Jewish rabble as “Constitutional” devotion generally is in those of higher law denouncers: “We have no king but Cæsar!” The argument before the Roman Governor was that Christ’s preaching would subvert the Roman authority, but among the Jews it was represented as aimed at their native constitution and laws. The people had finally come to be persuaded of this, for we find them taunting the cured blind man with the charge, “Thou art his disciple, but we are Moses’ disciples.” The political preaching of Jesus had been so impartial, that all parties had something against him, and insisted upon his sacrifice. His

crime was that he had vindicated humanity against the intolerance of race and of caste, and had maintained the truth against partisan bigotry of every kind ; and for this, not for spiritual preaching, they demanded and took his life.

Judge Black derives, from his *assumption* that Christ kept politics and religion "entirely separate," an argument that the modern preacher should in like manner ignore the existence of parties ; and he would therefore not complain were we to insist, in view of the foregoing facts, that the modern clergyman may employ the same direct and commanding way of dealing with party questions and public evils as his great Master employed. But we do not recognize the inference as a just one in either case. Had Christ seen fit to forego the discussion of political or party themes as entirely as he did dogmatic theology or physical science, it would not follow that the preacher and teacher of an American congregation is limited to a similar abstinence under all circumstances. The humble minister of a modern church, while taught by his Divine Master's example to preach the truth in righteousness, hit where it may, and to take aim so that it may hit, will not be expected to adopt a language and bearing on any topic, appropriate only to Him who announced himself as "The Son of God," "greater than Solomon or Abraham." And in accordance with this view we find the Apostles after Christ's ascension touching upon political and party themes much more sparingly than He, and with a more cautious tone. Yet there is enough on record to disprove entirely the claim that "they kept politics and religion entirely separate," and that "political preaching was unknown to the primitive Church." Our limits however have been already so far exceeded that we shall present only some of the cases to be found, and those with the utmost brevity.

Take first the case of Peter and John, who having been arrested during a street sermon by the legal authorities (Acts iv. 1), and locked up over night, are brought before the Supreme Court the next morning to answer the charge of political preaching. After a hearing, their doctrine is pronounced by the Court illegal and disorganizing, and they are enjoined against its public agitation. The Apostles plead the higher law duty "of obeying God rather than man ;" and, having re-

peated their offense, are arrested and held for contempt of Court. Again, their only defense is "the higher law," and they would have been sacrificed at once had not one sensible man (Gamaliel) procured a suspension of sentence by urging that political preaching would hurt nobody but the preacher if the doctrine was bad. Judge Black surely would not cite this as one of the cases in which the Apostles "uniformly inculcated the duty of *obedience* upon subjects."

So too, Stephen, when charged with preaching that "Jesus of Nazareth shall destroy this place, and change the customs that Moses delivered us, "pronounced a discourse which could not have been regarded otherwise than as a political harangue. Scornfully replying to the charge of depreciating the Mosaic constitution, he referred his audience to the manner in which their fathers had resisted Moses as long as they could, and charged his hearers with a similar perversity in rejecting Christ. He maintained that the Constitution was never designed to be permanent, and that zeal for its sacred character would be better displayed by acquiescing in its improvement. Can Judge Black possibly have read the speech of Stephen, when he declares that the Apostles "provoked no political revolutions, and proposed no legal reforms?"

The political preaching of Paul must be passed rapidly over. Wherever he went, contending for Gentile equality, and depreciating the ceremonial institutions of the nation, he aroused among his countrymen the bitterest bigotry of race and of party, arguing, and "mightily disputing" with them upon mooted questions of principle and of law. Repeatedly was he brought into collision with the Christians themselves, his own congregations, and clerical brethren, upon these matters of party and of caste, but in all cases he firmly insisted upon the right, whether they would hear, or whether they would forbear. If Judge Black will examine the Book of Acts, he will find it in great part a record of tumults stirred up against Paul for political preaching. At Philippi it was alledged before the magistrates—"These men being Jews do exceedingly trouble our city, and teach customs which it is not lawful for us to receive, neither to observe, being Romans"—(Acts xvi. 20). At Thessalonica, Jason was dragged before the City Rulers for

having harbored him as one of "those men that have turned the world upside down, doing contrary to the decree of Cæsar, saying that there is another king—one Jesus" (ch. 17, 6). At Ephesus (ch. 19, 26) it was charged that he preached against the "peculiar institutions and forms of labor" that prevailed there, and attacked the commercial and industrial interests of the region. The mob was stirred up by unbelieving Jews—haters of Gentile equality and political preachers;—to whose leader Paul, long after, in his Epistle to Timothy, could not refrain from bitter allusion with a designation not unheard of in our day—"Alexander, the *copper-smith*, hath done me much evil—The Lord reward him according to his works." At Jerusalem the cry was that he was a traitor to his country and her institutions—"he teacheth all men everywhere against the people, and the law, and this place;" and in the riot that ensued the mob listened patiently to his speech until he broached the topic of Gentile equality (ch. 22, 21), when they broke forth with uncontrollable rage: "Away with such a fellow from the earth, for it is not fit that he should live." It was during the public excitement of these proceedings that Paul, when in a critical situation before the Council, adroitly proclaimed his party affiliations, and claimed the protection of his party friends. "When Paul perceived" (probably by observing party bickering in the assembly) "that the one part were Pharisees and the other Sadducees, he cried out in the Council, "Men and Brethren, I am a Pharisee—the son of a Pharisee, of the hope and resurrection of the dead, I am called in question,"—and thereby set the meeting in an uproar of party contention. Being soon after brought before the Roman Governor upon a formal presentment by the Jewish authorities, Tertullus, the Attorney-General and prosecuting counsel on the part of the Government brought forward, as spitefully as his official successor Judge Black, the stereotype charge of political preaching (ch. 24, 5): "We have found this man a pestilent fellow and a mover of sedition among all the Jews throughout the world." A few days after, Paul preached to Felix a sermon which would have been regarded by Judge Black as most offensively "political." If it be "political preaching" to pronounce laudatory funeral sermons over a dead ruler, how much more to rebuke the vices of a living

one? * Think of a clergyman invited to preach before Andrew Johnson, selecting a sermon on *temperance*!

We cannot follow the subject into the Apostolic epistles, where much may be found illustrating our view. Judge Black feels himself called upon to account for and explain one passage which could not be overlooked (Rom. ch. xiii.), where Paul discourses on the duties of subjects to civil authority. By a paltry shuffle he insists that Paul counsels "simple submission, not active assistance to Nero." With two suggestions for Judge Black, we close this Article. St. Paul, as he shows, forbade rebellion against even the terrible oppression of the Roman tyrant. With what language, had he lived in our day, would he have addressed those who have countenanced, abetted, or sympathized with rebellion against the beneficent government of the United States, for the maintenance of caste and human slavery? What would he have said to men who, elevated by their fellow citizens to high places of power and confidence that they might preserve the government, betrayed their official trust, and delivered over the public liberty and safety to their enemies; and who, when dismissed from the positions they had betrayed, used what little personal influence they still imagined themselves to possess, in encouraging the bloody rebellion they had promoted? And once more, if Paul would never, as he says, have exaggerated the virtues of Nero—if he would not have compared him, after his death, to such men as Scipio, or Cato, or Abraham Lincoln,—with what unutterable disgust and abhorrence would he see, in 1866, the martyred Lincoln characterized as Nero!

* Judge Black uses the following language in considering Paul's counsel of obedience to Nero. The covert reference to President Lincoln throughout the passage is manifest:

"What Paul advised was simple submission, not active assistance to Nero. The Christians of that day did not indorse his atrocities merely because he was 'the administration duly placed in power.' They did not go with him to the theatre, applaud his acting, or praise him in the churches when he kidnapped their brethren, set fire to a city, or desolated a province. Nor did they assist at his apotheosis after his death, or pronounce funeral sermons to show that he was greater than Scipio, more virtuous than Cato, and more eloquent than Cicero. Political preachers would have done this, but Paul and Peter did no such thing."

ARTICLE IV.—MR. MITCHELL'S NOVEL, "DR. JOHNS."

Dr. Johns ; being a Narrative of Certain Events in the Life of an Orthodox Congregational Minister of Connecticut.

By DONALD G. MITCHELL, author of "Reveries of a Bachelor ;" "Dream Life ;" "My Farm at Edgewood," etc. In two vols. 12mo.

OUR English literature is peculiarly rich, especially at the present day, in the department of novels. The fame of De Foe and Fielding was obscured by the brilliant impression made by Sir Walter Scott ; yet those writers have merits so decided, that were it not for the taint of indecency that defiles their writings, they would forever retain their popularity among the classics of the language. Scott in his turn is eclipsed by Dickens and Thackeray, not to speak of numerous others of less renown. It may seem strange to persons old enough to have been the contemporaries of Scott, yet it is nevertheless the fact, that to many of the younger generation, who are not at all deficient in taste and culture, the once fascinating pages of the great novelist have lost their charm. The absence in Scott of what may be called the psychological element, which forms a characteristic feature and a principal attraction of the recent novels, is not atoned for by his powers of graphic description and by his other unquestionable merits. Without doubt, the decline of his popularity is partly due to that increasing sway of democratic ideas and feelings, in consequence of which the feudal ages are no longer clothed with a romantic interest, and distinctions of rank have less and less power to dazzle the imagination. The delineation of individual character in its growth and development forms no small part of the business of the modern novel. Among the recent works of fiction, not a few are included in the class termed by the Germans *tendenz-Romanen*—that is, novels designed to promulgate some opinion or effect some reform. It is remarkable, we may observe, that England should be the country in which the best novels are

written. The English are generally pronounced an insular people, in their mental qualities as well as in their geographical situation; a people incapable of going out of themselves and of comprehending others. Yet, in England works of more genuine humor, better novels, and better dramas are produced than anywhere else. This would seem to require us to qualify the verdict commonly declared relative to the Englishman's insular quality, and ignorance of all human nature except his own. Germany, the land of scholars and philosophers, is notoriously deficient in novels and dramatic works of high excellence. The finest plays of Goethe, Schiller, and Lessing are decidedly inferior in the distinctively dramatic element, not to speak here of general poetic merit, to the best English plays. German novels are generally dull, and frequently insipid. But it is not our design to enter into a general discussion of works of fiction, but rather to give some account of the late production of one of our own distinguished American writers, Mr. Mitchell.

Dr. Johns, whose name gives the title to Mr. Mitchell's novel, appears at first as plain Mr. Johns, a youthful preacher, fresh from such a theological training as was furnished in New England forty or fifty years ago. Something is told of his boyhood, enough to make us understand that the child was father of the man. After having preached several discourses in the pulpit of the Congregational Church in Ashfield, Connecticut, where the opinion of Squire Elderkin, which is supported by the voice of Deacon Tourtelot, that the young candidate is a "sound sermonizer," carries great influence, he is duly installed as pastor, and with his sweet young wife, Rachel, enters the parsonage in which the remainder of his life is to be spent. A son is born to him, an only child—Reuben. The mother dies young. Her death, and the memories connected with her, form a touching passage in the narrative. The importunities of certain parishioners, especially of Dame Tourtelot, the wife of the Deacon, whose daughter "Almiry" is of marriageable age and of a literary turn, fail of their direct end, but have the effect to induce the parson to procure a new housekeeper and companion, in the person of his sister, a stiff, elderly, unmarried lady, who afterwards fulfills, after her fashion, in the hospitalities of the parsonage and in the parish outside, the duties

expected of a "minister's wife." Little Reuben finds the chilly benevolence of this formal aunt a poor substitute for the warm and gushing sympathy of a mother's heart. But he is partly comforted by the introduction into the family of the little girl Adèle, the daughter of the minister's college classmate, Maverick, who sends from France this vivacious and beautiful creature, that she may be sheltered and educated in a quiet New England home. The mystery that hangs over the domestic relations of Maverick, and over the mother of Adèle, is a very important element in the plot of the story. The mother is living, but how and where? Adèle knows nothing of her, and supposes her to be dead. Reuben and Adèle, the frank, generous-hearted boy Phil Elderkin, and his fair young sister Rose, grow up together in mutual friendship and close association. Unconsciously to all, Adèle is awakening a feeling in the hearts of both Reuben and Frank, that may ripen into something deeper than a childish attachment, and Reuben is inspiring Rose with a like sentiment. With the relations and fortunes of these four persons, the development of the story is closely connected. Reuben, a whole-souled, active, mischievous lad, finds nothing in the religious counsels of his father and aunt to meet his nature. A certain doctrinal austerity in Dr. Johns repels the son, who, nevertheless, is obliged to recognize a deep and sincere principle of godliness at the bottom of his father's whole life. Reuben at length goes to New York, to engage in business as an assistant in an uncle's counting-house. There, after a while, he is caught by the temptations about him, and runs a brief career of dissipation. But happening to hear a fervid preacher discourse upon the fatherhood of God, he is moved by an aspect of Christianity which had not before been impressed upon his attention. Melted into penitence, he gives up his vices and "experiences religion." Once more he is at the Ashfield parsonage, and engaged in the study of Divinity. But the longer he studies, the greater are the difficulties and perplexities in which he finds himself involved. His mind becomes a prey to skepticism, so that at last he throws aside his theological reading, and with it, to the great sorrow of his father, his religious professions. Before this mental change occurs, the influence going out from the freshness and

glow of his new feelings has had the effect to determine Adèle to a decided act of trust and of self-consecration to God. The accidental visit, and continued stay in Ashfield, of a French lady, a teacher of the French language, had been for Adèle an event of striking significance. An intimacy had established itself between them. Maverick had wished that the intercourse of his daughter with this person, the sight of whom had once led him hastily to leave Ashfield without seeing those whom he came to visit, should be prohibited, and the stranger at length took up her abode with the outcast daughter of the tavern-keeper, with one who was under the social ban of the village, as the victim of seduction and the mother of an illegitimate child. Finally, the French woman dies in the arms of Adèle, who, with the good Dr. Johns, had called to see her at the opportune time; and in the moment of death utters words which, in connection with other evidence, excites in the mind of Adèle the belief that the dying stranger is her mother. It turns out that she is a sister of her mother, bearing to the latter so close a resemblance as to deceive even Maverick. The real mother, in her youth the comparatively innocent party to a guilty *liaison* with Maverick, penitent for her sin, and a devout Catholic, is at length accidentally confronted with him, after so many years of separation. They are reunited, now by a lawful and sacred bond, and the mother embarks for America, in order to see the long lost Adèle, whom she loves tenderly as a daughter but looks upon as a benighted heretic. It happens that Reuben, who had resumed business and gone to Europe, is on the same vessel, and the two are brought together. As the ship draws near to port, it encounters a tempest. The wife of Maverick perishes. The life of Reuben is barely saved; his injuries are fatal, and he is carried to his father's home to die. In the great church of St. Peter at Rome, he had been struck by the words, "*œdificabo meam Ecclesiam.*" The thought of this majestic sentence, and of its historic fulfillment, fell in with a change of feeling already begun, and served to infuse a new religious faith into his heart—a faith independent of doctrines, and self-sustained in the sentiments of the soul. On his death-bed, this faith supports him and gives comfort to his father, notwithstanding certain misgivings of the latter on

the ground that his son's views are not clearer on the "great scheme of the Atonement," and on some other doctrines. The mutual love of Reuben and Adèle finds expression; and in this death the story reaches the tragic point. It is needless to give further details. After an interval of a few years, Frank Elderkin marries Adèle, his long love thus gaining its reward, while his sister gives her hand to the young minister, the colleague of the venerable Doctor, who has grown old in the progress of the story. We fancy that most of Mr. Mitchell's readers will quarrel with him for bringing his tale to this conclusion. It would seem that Frank might have been allowed to find his consolation and his happiness elsewhere; and what we are told of the young minister will scarcely leave the reader satisfied with this disposition of Rose. The author might at least have raised up Reuben to health by some marvelous remedy, and then have made him the husband of Adèle.

The above is a meagre outline of this entertaining story. It contains not a few genuine strokes of humor and pathos. The interest of the tale constantly increases to the close, the latter half being much more effective than the beginning. In general the characters are skillfully delineated. In particular is this true of Dr. Johns himself, Reuben, and Adèle, the persons in whom the charm of the story chiefly centres. It is a work the artistic merits of which deserve much commendation.

There is another point of view from which this work must be considered. It proposes to be a picture of social life in a New England town, and especially of the religion and religious teaching of New England. Dr. Johns is a Congregational minister who is presented to us as he appeared in the family, in the pulpit, and among his people; the scene of the story is a Connecticut parish. We are called upon to judge of the fairness of the picture which is here drawn of our New England life. The tone of this book is not irreligious or unreligious. Generally speaking, the proper place is given to Christ in the development of a religious life, and a due impression is made in respect to the value and supreme necessity of religious trust. Nor is there a failure to appreciate certain excellent features in that type of piety which the author attributes to the principal character in the story. The reader is made to feel that

Dr. Johns has "the root of the matter in him." His prayers come from a deep place, and move the heart of every listener. The seriousness, the fidelity, the unvarying consistency, the self-abnegation of his character, are shown to extort the respect of those who find in him little else to applaud. His parsonage, even after the angular Aunt Eliza takes the place of the gentle and loving Rachel, proves a safe home for Adèle, and neither author nor reader finds fault with the worldly-wise Maverick for choosing for his daughter this place, as one well fitted to guard her simplicity and truthfulness, and unfold her mind to the best advantage. But notwithstanding these points in the author's description of the minister and the parish of Ashfield, it is evident that he looks with no little repugnance upon many of the religious and social characteristics which he undertakes to portray. He considers the Ashfield type of Christianity, and the ways and manners engendered by it, as narrow and austere. "Rigid" is a word of very frequent occurrence on his pages. Dr. Johns is rigid, his conceptions of Christian truth are rigid, his theory of life is rigid, his sister is rigid, his parish is rigid, and, in short, everything about the religion of Ashfield is repulsively rigid. An ungenial rigor prevails in the atmosphere of the place. The preaching is metaphysical. Religious feeling must submit to flow in doctrinal moulds, and is suspected if it do not run in the wonted channels. Roman Catholics are regarded as no better than pagan idolaters. Transgressors are dealt with in a spirit too little compassionate, and the sins of the parent, in some cases, bring contempt upon the head of the child. Amusements are scanned with a suspicious eye, especially such as afford most pleasure. Aunt Eliza is filled with pious horror when six or eight young people, casually assembled in Squire Elderkin's parlor, spend an evening hour in dancing. Not unfrequently under sanctimonious manners and religious professions, there lurk an unpleasant amount of worldly shrewdness, a keenness in driving a bargain that goes to the very verge of honesty, and a hard, unsparing temper towards the poor, which is the more intense if their poverty is connected with imprudence. Perhaps the leading counts in this *quasi* indictment of New England parochial life may be put under three heads. The

first is the obtruding of doctrines, or formal, technical statements of Christian truth, such as are wrought out by the understanding, in places where they do not belong. Thus a logical, cold, dry cast is given to the warm and living verities of the Gospel. Occasionally our author seems to find fault with the truth itself which underlies the dogma, as in the case of the doctrine of sin. But in this and in other cases, the teaching, which he impliedly censures, is substantially conformed to the general creed of Christendom. If the New England preacher is condemned, the Anglican and Romanist fall under the same condemnation, and this lights at last upon Scripture itself. It is surely no fault if Dr. Johns, and such as he, give reality and practical force to an article of common belief. The main thing which excites repugnance is not, however, the doctrine, so much as the obtruding of it, in its theological form, beyond its proper sphere. The second blemish in Ashfield Christianity is nearly related to the foregoing. It may be described as a general lack of sentiment. The æsthetic and poetical side of nature and life is a sealed book. The mind is schooled to exclusively practical views. Some of the finer instincts of nature are stunted in their growth. A warm and catholic sympathy with human nature in its infinite varieties of innocent manifestation is wanting. The failings and infirmities of men are too harshly judged. The full play and right culture of the more refined sensibilities are missed. This life and the next are made too much the subject of calculation, and estimated by a too bald application of the rules of profit and loss. Contracted views of the Christian life form the third item in the implied criticism of the religion of New England. The ideas of duty have been tinged, it is thought, with asceticism. An unnatural gravity has been exacted of the young. Harmless forms of recreation have been proscribed, either because they may be perverted into an occasion of evil, or for no better reason than because they are in vogue outside of the church. There has been too much prohibition of that which is evil, or supposed to be evil, compared with the recommendation of that which is good. Religion has been too much associated with sombre manners. Religion has taken the place of a taskmaster, rather than that of a guide and cheerful friend.

Life has been cramped ; it has been constrained where constraint is both irksome and unnecessary. Instead of seeking to leaven all pleasure, as well as all work, with the Christian spirit, in this way appropriating, while it elevates, whatever in the practices of the world is not contrary to the principles of the Gospel, the prevalent teaching has adopted too much the easier policy of forbidding outright what it ought to chasten and regulate.

These remarks will give an idea of the darker lines which we find traced in the picture before us. We are far from intending to affirm that such criticisms upon New England are wholly without foundation. We are disposed to be as liberal in our concessions on this point as the truth requires. There is no room for denying that religious teaching, in the pulpit and out of it, in the last generation assumed a metaphysical cast. Sermons were devoted to the explanation and defense of doctrinal formulas. It was expected that religious experience should connect itself with these, and pass through a defined series of stages. So whole-souled a man as Lyman Beecher states that he rode over to Guilford from New Haven on purpose to dissolve his matrimonial engagement with an excellent young lady, in case he should find her not up to the point of Hopkinsian "disinterested submission." It must be conceded that important aspects and applications of Christianity were frequently left out of this teaching, and it is no wonder if a class of minds not averse to religion found little to meet their spiritual hunger ; but it must be remembered that for a while this metaphysical style of teaching accorded with a widespread taste among the people. These discussions were for a period intensely relished. Religious emotion, in many cases, naturally connected itself with forms of statement, which, under different circumstances, would awaken but little feeling. As the popular taste changed, there was, of necessity, a transition period, in which the former method began to be repulsive. There was a call for a more lively, diversified, and popular style of pulpit teaching. There is, also, some truth in the allegation that too little space has been conceded to sentiment, in the habitual tone and arrangements of New England social life. There were many people who, to be sure, were good, but *hard*. They measured thing

by a severely utilitarian standard. The industrious, thrifty habits of New England, which, in many respects, have been so fruitful of benefits, have been attended by some traits not so pleasant to contemplate. In case the spirit of religion became enfeebled, a close, niggardly, grasping love of money frequently gained the upper hand. The sacrifice of anything to mere sentiment has been widely, even if unconsciously, deprecated. Think of the burial-places in New England, as they were until a recent period! The most barren field was often selected as a receptacle of the dead. It was left almost without care. No pains were taken to surround the last resting-place of dear friends with trees and flowers. The "grave-yard" was the most gloomy, uninviting spot in the village. We notice this fact simply because it is one expression and a symbol of a style of feeling that was quite prevalent within the memory of many who are still living. The provisions for the relief of innocent poverty had little, if any, reference to the sensibility of those who, often through age or infirmity, were involved in this calamity. They were "paupers," and to be a pauper was deemed to be a disgrace hardly less to be shunned than crime. It must likewise be conceded that an ascetic element has mingled to some extent in the piety of New England. Christian life among us is not yet wholly freed from the influence of narrow, unintelligent views. Take the matter of amusements. There are various games and other pastimes which have been frowned upon by those who would not be able to found their condemnation of them upon any clear and sound rule of Christian ethics. Games of chance have been forbidden on the groundless and absurd pretext that in them an appeal is made to Chance as a kind of divinity. Some of the most enlightened writers on morals especially commend games involving an element of chance, for the reason that sports depending solely upon skill are apt to excite in young people feelings of jealousy and unpleasant rivalry. Many will remember when the game of nine-pins was a forbidden amusement. Now our college gymnasiums are furnished with a row of alleys for the practice of this mode of physical exercise. A like superstition in regard to billiards is fast vanishing from enlightened minds. But many of those who laugh at the solemn condemnation

once visited on these innocent forms of recreation, might find it difficult to explain the abhorrence which they still feel for card-playing. We do not design to enter into a discussion of the subject of amusements, but merely to call attention to the ill-defined, and for the most part, traditional notions which good people still entertain in regard to them. The principle has been adopted that whatever is liable to be abused, or turned into an instrument of evil, is to be abjured,—a principle, the falsehood of which is apparent. Under the operation of this sweeping rule, innoxious recreations and amusements have been denounced. Luther said that all the good tunes should not be given up to the Devil; and an enlightened Christianity will say the same of other things that afford innocent pleasure. Whether dancing be objectionable or not depends entirely on the circumstances under which it takes place; and to use such language respecting this amusement as pertains properly to sins of an aggravated character, like lying, is to countenance superstition. That religion consists in the *love of God and man* is a simple lesson, but one which the world, even the most intelligent portion of it, is slow to learn.

But when the foibles and the grave faults of New England Christianity in the past have been all recited, some explanation must be given of the character and condition of the New England of to-day. There are phenomena for which a stranger would find no solution in the pages of this novel. Look at the State of Connecticut and the neighboring State of Massachusetts, which have been closely united from their first settlement. Here are these commonwealths: "behold them, and judge for yourselves!" Where can there be found on the face of the earth political communities which surpass them, or even equal them, in all the elements of Christian civilization? Nearly the entire population of these States have been taught to read and write. The number of persons who are destitute of the rudiments of learning is smaller here than anywhere else on the globe. Nowhere else is intelligence so widely diffused. The humblest cottage is not without its books and newspapers. Nowhere else are the hardships of poverty so little felt. In no other community is the population more generally industrious and thrifty. Here have been established, chiefly by private

beneficence, the best colleges in the land, whilst good schools for all the people are maintained at the public cost. In no other country is more abundant provision made, by means of hospitals and asylums, for the relief of the suffering. These communities are not excelled by any people under the sun in the amount of their spontaneous benefactions. Charged with parsimony, they are in reality the most liberal in the bestowal of property where there is distress to be relieved, or ignorance to be enlightened. Blot out from American literature the works of New Englanders, of the historians, poets, scholars who have been born on our soil, and comparatively few distinguished names would be left. The outward prosperity of these States and the long enjoyment of peace have not dulled their manhood. At the outbreak of the rebellion the people flew to arms, and entered into war with the same adventurous courage, unfaltering perseverance, and effective intelligence which they had displayed in the arts of peace. When we look at these communities with just pride and admiration, we are also to remember that for more than half a century they have been pouring out over the territories lying westward a large portion of their best population. New Englanders have been emigrating to the city of New York, to the western part of the State of New York, to Ohio, to the Mississippi, and beyond its banks, until the wonder is that we have anything left. They have done much towards building up new and powerful States, which they have planted with the institutions and impregnated with the ideas of their old home. How many of the brave soldiers and eminent leaders in our late war claim a New England parentage! And yet the old home tree is as fresh, and green, and vigorous as ever.

How shall we account for the New England of to-day? A stranger, perusing Mr. Mitchell's book, might be at a loss to answer; and this not through any intentional fault of the author. In truth, it is the *religion* of New England, more than anything else, that has made New England what it is. "A tree is known by its fruits: do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?" Religion was the prevailing subject of thought and discussion, the pervading, controlling element in the people's life. It was the religion of New England, and

the regard for the human soul which religious faith inspired, that led our fathers to provide means for the education of all, and likewise moved them to lay the foundations of academies and colleges. It was the religion of New England that prompted the people to industry and prudent economy, and made them consider idleness a sin. It was their religion that made them thoughtful men, training the intellect as well as forming the character. It was the discussion of these "rigid" doctrines that disciplined the mind. In the study of the great themes relating to the divine administration and human destiny, the intellect of New England acquired its fibre. We have said that the thrift of our people was an offshoot of their piety. Piety and thrift lie at the basis of New England's prosperity. What if, in the early days of New England, or even later, the people had been unthrift? With a soil no more fertile, and a climate no more hospitable, into what condition would society have fallen? But, as we have said, they practised frugality as a duty; and thereby gained the means of doing good on a scale which deserves the admiration of less liberal communities which are inclined to deride the Yankee virtue of prudence.

Now suppose that the religion of New England had been different. Suppose that in place of the grave discussion of religious truth in the meeting-house, and at the fireside, in place of the contact of the minds of the people with the abstract truths and doctrines of Christianity, there had been a religion of sentiment fostered by a ritual, nourished by the sight of the crucifix, and by delicious music,—a religion that arises in the soul we know not how, and which can give no rational account of itself, for the reason that it depends on no clear, intelligent perception of truth. What would New England have been, and have done, if such had been her religion? What would have been the intellect of New England? and what would have been the state of morals flowing from such a religious system? The settlers of a wilderness, and their descendants for several generations, will find little opportunity for æsthetic culture. Fighting Indians and building stone walls are unfavorable to this class of accomplishments. But wait for a while. Everything comes in due season. When the rougher work has been done,

there will appear men like the graceful writer of this volume, the son of a New England Congregational minister; and there will appear a generation qualified to read with a relish the productions of his pen. The oak must be allowed to grow ere it can support the vine.

While the subject is before us, we have another observation to make respecting New England. The question has been asked, why every politician of the baser sort, who sets himself to defend slavery, or any other social evil, has an arrow in his quiver to discharge at New England. Declamation against Puritanism has become very common among demagogues, to say nothing of public men who would deem themselves insulted if called by that name. We believe that the real source of this rancor is in the simple fact that the Puritans of New England have held to the distinction between right and wrong, and have steadfastly insisted on applying it in the practical concerns of life, not excluding political action. The claims of the eternal law of righteousness upon magistrates, and upon a people, in their political conduct, have been pressed, greatly to the inconvenience of unprincipled or compromising politicians. If political affairs could only be allowed to go on without the meddlesome interference of moral considerations, this class of men would have a smooth path. After all, religion and morality are made too practical by the very people who are frequently accused of carrying them into the region of abstractions. Hence the animosity with which Puritanism, and New England, the seat of Puritanism, excite in the hearts of that numerous class of American politicians who practically, if not avowedly, hold "that religion has nothing to do with politics."

Important obligations rest upon those who still adhere to the ancient faith and order of the New England churches. Against aggressions from whatever quarter, we are bound to exert ourselves to retain whatever was good in the past, to hold fast to the distinctive excellencies of the religious system in which we have been educated. In opposition to the inroads of a sentimental rationalism, we must continue to assert the importance of a clear, manly teaching and inculcation of the truths of the Christian system. Whatever tends to emasculate pulpit teach-

ing, make it merely a perfunctory work, a less important adjunct in a round of church services, or resolve it into the reading of vague homilies without power to wake up the minds or affect the consciences of men, will not only have the effect to deaden the earnest spirit of religion, but will, at the same time, enervate the intellect of the people. The form and style of religious instruction vary from age to age. The truth must be cast into new and living statements. But whatever changes of this nature are appropriate to accommodate a changed era in culture and taste, the main point must not be given up, that Christian truth is to be distinctly stated, explained, discussed, defended, inculcated, and urged upon the conscience; and that this is the great work of the Protestant preacher—a work not to be postponed in deference to a clamor for a more elaborate ritual or a sentimental craving for "more worship." There is another obligation equally imperative. We are bound to adopt and cherish catholic views both in regard to the terms of church communion and in regard to the Christian life. We do not hesitate to say that the doctrinal tests which are imposed upon applicants for membership in most of our Congregational Churches, even upon children, are not authorized by the Scriptures, and are both wrong and baneful. The qualification for admission into the visible fold of the Saviour is repentance towards God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. It is character, the essential elements of Christian experience, which qualifies a man to join the Christian brotherhood. Whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil. The constitution of the Church is determined by its founder. He has defined what shall constitute discipleship, and what are the qualifications for baptism and communion with the Church. No body of Christians have a right to depart from this law and set up a different standard. If complaints are made of the growth of the Episcopalian denomination, it must be remembered that the uncatholic constitution of many of our churches in the particular just named, is in no small degree responsible for the fact. It is high time to return from our innovations to the simpler, more Christian arrangements of the early churches of New England. The other matter in which a revision of traditional notions is required, is the general subject of the Christian life.

Heaven forbid that we should speak a word that favors a lax morality, or advocate the slightest departure in the manners and customs of society from the dictates of the pure spirit of Christianity. But the question is, what does the spirit of the Gospel permit, and what does it forbid? And here we are sure that there is a great need of renewed reflection, which may lead to broader, more enlightened views, on the part of most of our people. It is harmful to deny to the young amusements which their consciences, even in after life, are incapable of condemning. It is a mistake to make Christianity, even in appearance, a yoke of ordinances. The great inquiry should be, not what is the fashion among professed Christians, what was thought to be right or wrong at a former day, but rather what is really contrary to the spirit of truth and the spirit of love? What may be practiced without damping the flame of love to God and man, which, as we have said, is the essence of religion, the substance and soul of goodness, the final result, in the heart, of the redemptive work of Christ? Narrow views of the Christian life, within our denomination, are the second great cause of the progress of the Episcopal Church in New England. In connection with these observations, there is room for a word on a kindred topic. There are many in Congregational Churches, and among them are especially to be reckoned educated persons, who chafe under the minute and meddlesome surveillance over their conduct and manners which is sometimes assumed by individuals who have little claim on the score of knowledge to act the part of censors. In things indifferent, things not determined by plain precepts of the Gospel or obvious inferences flowing from them, the private judgment of the individual Christian must be respected. We may differ from his judgment on some occasions; we may regret and even deplore the conclusions to which he is led on a great variety of questions, but it is not our business to govern him, or to visit him with penalties because he does not conform to our ideas of what is expedient. If a reasonable degree of independence is not conceded to the individual, church membership becomes an intolerable yoke. Men will seek for some communion in which they are not subject to an impertinent interference under the guise of fraternal watchfulness. The

Apostle Paul is often misrepresented by being claimed among the authorities for this infringement of Christian independence. He does not teach that we are to be governed by the consciences of other people. He expressly repudiates this doctrine. No man is to find his rule of conduct in a neighbor's conscience. He says that if a practice—his example is the eating of meat offered in sacrifice to idols—which is guiltless, is yet thought to be wrong by a *weak* brother, and if he is to be led by my example into an act which his conscience mistakenly condemns, but which for him would be sin, then love will prompt me to refrain from the innocent practice for his sake. This is very different from saying that I am to be governed by the views of Christian duty which other people entertain, and follow their convictions instead of my own. The Apostle Paul was the last man to give his sanction to this galling species of servitude. Even the maxim which he does announce has its limitations, which common sense will suggest. We are not bound to foster by example more than by precept unfounded prejudice and superstitious belief, especially when the result will be to hold forth to the world a distorted image of Christian character and a perverted representation of Christian life.

We have been led into a train of remark which has a natural, though not a necessary, connection with the volume, the title of which stands at the head of this Article. We regard Mr. Mitchell's book as a story of real power and genuine pathos, and if his picture of New England country life might, with no violation of truth, have been filled out in some directions, so that the total impression left on the reader's mind would have been different, we are yet persuaded that he has not written in a captious or disingenuous spirit. We can not apply to him, born and bred in New England, the maxim, *fas est ab hostibus doceri*; and yet we think that his work may be profitably read by orthodox Congregationalists, for the reason that it emanates from a point of view quite outside of their system.

ARTICLE V.—DR. HEDGE'S ADDRESS TO THE ALUMNI
OF HARVARD.

Address to the Alumni of Harvard at their Triennial Festival, July 19th, 1866. Printed in the Atlantic Monthly for September, 1866.

THIS address of Dr. Hedge has been so widely diffused, by being published in the Atlantic Monthly, that we may assume that it has been read by a considerable portion of our readers. We notice it, not on account of its intrinsic excellence, for it is hardly equal to the occasion and the principal theme, but for the purpose of briefly discussing one or two of the subjects brought forward in it, which are of especial interest.

The first of these is the new form given to the Board of Overseers of Harvard, by a recent change of the charter, in virtue of which the classes of Overseers annually elected by the General Court of the State, are hereafter to be elected by the ballot of Bachelors of five years' standing, of Masters of Arts, and of persons who have received any honorary degree. The ballots are to be cast on Commencement Day, in the city of Cambridge, commencing with the year 1866. From this privilege of voting, if we are to interpret the term "honorary degree" in its ordinary sense, all bachelors in law and in science, all doctors in medicine, and all graduates who may be admitted to any new degree obtained on examination, which the authorities of the University may hereafter establish, are excluded. This exclusion may have been the result of carelessness and of the habit in times past of regarding the College as the whole of the University; if intended, we should ascribe it to a narrow spirit desirous of keeping all power within the ranks of the graduates in arts. The effect of the change will be to introduce in six years an entirely new element into the government of the university, to separate it altogether from

the control of the State, and to make graduates of Harvard its overseers and highest board of guardians.

Harvard has been, in our view, quite unfortunate in its constitution, and more particularly in these two respects: that it is governed by two boards rather than by one, and that one of these boards has been a political body.

The Board of Overseers was created in the very infancy of Harvard College, and consisted of the Governor and Deputy Governor, together with all the magistrates of the Massachusetts Colony, and also of "the teaching elders of the six next adjoining towns, viz.: Cambridge, Watertown, Charlestown, Boston, Roxbury, and Dorchester, together with the President of the College." All the law-making power and all management of the revenues were put into their hands. As yet, the College was not a corporation. In 1650, a corporation was created, consisting of seven persons—a president, five fellows, and a treasurer or bursar, having power, with the consent of the overseers, to elect a new president, fellows, or treasurer, in case of death or other removal from office, to hold property not exceeding five hundred pounds yearly rent, and, among other things, to choose such officers and make such orders as they should think fit, provided such orders were consented to by the overseers. These members of the corporation are not necessarily resident at the College according to the charter of 1650, or according to long usage; but inasmuch as the tutors were called Fellows of the House, and as several of the non-resident Fellows or members of the corporation were obnoxious to a party among the Overseers and in the Colony, an attempt was made, about the year 1721, to oust the non-resident members of that board, and to supply their places by the election of officers of the College. The quarrel which arose between the two boards, in which also the Legislature, taking the side of the Overseers, participated, is related fully, if not quite impartially, in the fourteenth chapter of President Quincy's History. The original intention at the very origin of Harvard was, we are inclined to believe, to have a corporation of resident fellows; and indeed as there was neither then, nor for a long time afterwards, any Faculty or subordinate governing body under that board, their entire non-residence

would have destroyed all discipline. But the principle being settled, and the growth of a Faculty having at length rendered the necessity of a resident corporation unnecessary, no serious attempts were afterwards made, if we are correctly informed, to interfere with the corporation's rights, and the constitution of that body has continued unchanged until the present time. In 1780, a new practice, not involving an alteration of the constitution, of electing a non-resident layman, was introduced to advantage, only non-resident clergymen having been adopted into the board before.

The Board of Overseers, however, has undergone several more or less important modifications. It was necessary in 1779, when a new constitution took the place of the royal charter, to decide who should be the successors of the former political functionaries in the board, and accordingly, with the consent of the corporation, they were made to consist of the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, Council, and Senate, the other members remaining the same as before. Far more important was the measure of the year 1810, by which the Senate of the State, except its President, was shut out of the board, the Speaker of the House became one of its members, and fifteen ministers of Congregational Churches, with fifteen laymen, were substituted for the ministers of the six towns. This act was accepted by both boards of the College, and yet, in 1812, it was repealed by the Legislature, and the provisions of the charter previously in force were restored. The boards refused to submit to this legislative usurpation, and for a time there were two boards of Overseers, until, in 1814, by a compromise between the contending parties, the Senate of the State was readmitted to its former place, the act of 1810 in other respects continuing in force. In 1834, "any stated minister of the Church of Christ might be elected among the fifteen." When President Quincy published his History in 1840, this was the constitution of the Board of Overseers; but by an act of May, 1851, to which the legal assent of the boards was given, the Senate and Council disappear from the board, which is now made to consist of seven persons, taking their places *ex officio*—the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Board of Education, and the President

and Treasurer of the University—together with the thirty members who belonged to it before. These members were now divided into six classes, one of which gave place annually to a new set, five in number, elected by the General Court and holding their office for six years. Finally, by the alteration in the charter of 1865, all the State officers who had *ex officio* belonged to the board ceased to be members of it, and the thirty were to be elected by graduates of the College, as has been already mentioned.

The constitution of the governing boards at Harvard has contained, in our judgment, several pretty serious defects. In the first place, the corporation is too small. Being a compact body, the members of which naturally live in the neighborhood of the University and can be easily assembled, it cannot fail, we should suppose, to exercise an undue control over the Faculties, to overrule their decisions and thwart their wishes, under the impression of being intimately and personally acquainted with the state of affairs at Cambridge. Moreover, as a body capable, on account of its size, of acting with vigor, secrecy and settled policy, it would naturally excite the jealousy of the more unwieldy Board of Overseers. Still greater fault may be found with the existence of two boards, and with the constitution of the larger one. Two boards besides a Faculty, which must, in order to do any good and act with any efficiency, have the power of making by-laws, form a very cumbersome machinery, nor can we see any sufficient reason for the existence of a Board of Overseers except in the fact that the corporation is too small. One board and a Faculty, responsible, yet having a somewhat independent action, are surely enough for healthy legislation, enough for vigorous discipline, enough for the election of the best officers, and enough to secure the confidence of the public. But apart from this, the Board of Overseers has heretofore been an unhappily constituted body. It contained the elements of strife with the corporation whenever the elections went against the political party to which they were supposed to belong; and its members, especially the clerical portion, might easily bring with them into their official position the jealousies or animosities of religious creeds and sects. Add to this that it is a public body,

whose acts and debates are often spread abroad through the land like those of legislative assemblies, and that when the Senate and Council of the State belonged to it, it was enormously large, incapable of regular orderly action, and likely to be composed in part of persons not at all qualified by previous knowledge for the task devolved on them. We have seldom been more disgusted than when the debates of this body on the qualifications of a gentleman elected as President of the university by the corporation were spread through the world by the newspapers, when the opinion of men like Mr. Everett, given no doubt with the greatest unwillingness that they should be made public, became a sort of public condemnation of one who needed all support at his entrance upon a most responsible office.

Such are some of the objections we have against the board of Overseers, as it was formerly constituted, objections which are fully justified by the disputes between the two boards, of which instances can readily be found on the pages of President Quincy's history. The recent change will remove a part of the causes of disharmony. There will be no more political nor bitter religious animosity represented in the board of Overseers. The members will, as a body, be animated by a loyal spirit of affection towards their Alma Mater. Inasmuch as persons of high standing will be elected, the University will look to them with confidence for all assistance in those schemes of enlargement which shall command the approval of the great body of graduates. And yet what we regard as the radical vices of the Harvard charter, two boards, a small corporation, and a large board of Overseers, still remain. What is there, again, under the altered charter to prevent party tickets among the graduates, with the necessary excitements before and ill-feeling after the election? Nor is it certain that the jealousies of former times between the corporation and the overseers may not yet be renewed.

We are tempted at this place to turn to another College, with a very different set of governors, and inquire whether a similar plan of graduate election, can be engrafted on its charter with advantage. The charter of Yale College, until 1792, made the ten original founders, with their successors, in per-

petuity,—including also, after a time, the Rector, or President, as the charter of 1745 called him—the Corporation. They were in their corporate name the President and Fellows of Yale College in New Haven. This constitution was altered in 1792, so as to admit the Governor and Lieutenant-Governor, with six senior assistants in the council, into the Board; the causes of the change being a not unreasonable jealousy on the part of civilians of a board wholly composed of ministers, a feeling that the College would have more protection from the State if more plainly under its protection, and the prospect of a handsome endowment from the State. The change was a good one. The new board, consisting of nineteen, would not be unwieldy, even if all the members were in their place, and many questions of finance needed the counsel of the lay members. The change has worked well on the whole, and has continued, with minor alterations, until the present time. A change in the rules of doing business deserves mention, by which a quorum was made to consist of a majority both of the whole board and of the original members of it, the rule before having been that a quorum of both *parts* of the board was necessary.

This rule discloses to us the principal defect of the amended charter. Why was the rule concerning a quorum necessary? Because the six members of the council—or Senators, as they were called in the State Constitution of 1817—could not be relied upon to be present. The Governor and Lieutenant-Governor have been tolerably punctual in their attendance, but the Senators in general take little interest in the proceedings, are apt to withdraw before the close of the meetings, and seem to feel that they are in a strange place. We have looked over the records of thirty-five meetings, and find that their average attendance is $2\frac{1}{2}$, or less than one half. Nor is it likely that it will ever be greater, while the clerical members are seldom absent—on the average scarcely one out of eleven.

In this state of things we cannot but feel that the connexion between the College and the State is, as far as the deputation from the Senate is concerned, a mere form—a form which does no harm to the College that we know of, but which adds nothing to the efficiency and dignity of its corporation. Men are

wanted in that place who will feel it their duty to be present, but it is idle, we conceive, to expect punctuality from the Senators, as the Senate is at present constituted. They change every year, so that the same man rarely reappears in the council of the College. They have no time to learn what duties are expected from them, nor to become acquainted with the condition and wants of the institution. They are in some cases men who take very little interest in the higher seminaries of learning, or perhaps even question their utility altogether. Neither sympathy then, nor knowledge, nor power to uphold a permanent policy belongs to them to any great extent. In this state of things, if some Senator of Connecticut should incline to advocate a change of the system—in favor of which we have already heard an opinion expressed by one member of that honorable body—the reasonableness of the measure might gain a general assent, and we know not why the Corporation ought to refuse to give its vote for such an alteration of its charter. Let the voters be all masters of arts and graduates of a higher, or an equal rank, together with Bachelors of all the Faculties of five years standing; let that part of the Board now elected from the Senate of the State, and with them, if thought best, as at Harvard, the two highest magistrates of the Commonwealth give place to graduates, who shall hold their offices for at least six or eight years, and be reëligible, when their term expires; let the elections be held not every year, but every other year, or even less frequently;—will not the result be greater interest, punctuality, knowledge, sense of responsibility, and devotion to the welfare of the institution on the part of the new members; will they not, if well elected, be a new strength of their Alma Mater; will they not bring with them views at once enlightened and conservative?

We have dwelt longer than we intended on this, which is not the main point of Dr. Hedge's address, and have less space to devote to his principal theme. It is the old story of reform in college studies, of a greater latitude and privilege of selection among the numerous branches of knowledge.

New sciences it is said have arisen since the revival of letters, some of them within the last hundred years. New languages have drawn their life from the extinct Latin, or have grown

into beauty and importance where the forests of Germany once stood, or upon the more northern coasts and islands, or they have been laid open to the studies of philologists since the eastern world has come into nearer contact with the western. New literatures, more noble than the Latin, and breathing the spirit of modern times, have been created. New philosophies of thought and being have arisen. History has assumed a new face altogether. Why should the discipline of four centuries ago be the discipline of our age and of future ages? Why should Greek and Latin be the sole or the principal instrument for cultivating thought? Or why should there be any common discipline, why any one or two classes of studies be regarded as the only rightful occupants of the schools? Why not permit every parent to choose what his son shall pursue in college, or, what is the same thing, permit the youth to choose for himself? Or if the college comes forward and points to its catalogue, where natural science, metaphysics, some history, some criticism is interspersed among the studies in the dead languages and the mathematics, the cry now changes, and with some justice it is claimed that too much is required, a little of almost everything,—instead of plain healthy beef and potatoes, a mouthful of every dish that the eating-house has on its bill of fare.

But there is another consideration which the reformers of colleges urge, Dr. Hedge among the rest, the justice of which cannot altogether be denied. The present system is one of coercion, and coercion is opposed to all intellectual growth. The question what a youth shall study, ought to be left to himself, how he shall behave to himself and to the civil law. "Academic jurisdiction should have no criminal code, should inflict no penalty but that of expulsion, and that only in the way of self-defense against positively noxious and dangerous members." Appeals to the honor of young men are the best method to put down "hazing" and other tricks that infest colleges. Liberty of study, liberty of conduct, abandonment of the present system of college police is then the watchword of the reform which Dr. Hedge calls for. Experience has shown that excessive legislation creates two parties, and these two parties "have always existed at Cambridge within the memory

of the oldest graduate." And if this system would meet with an obstacle in the present age or maturity of college youths, Dr. Hedge would advance the qualifications for admission, and reduce the college career from four years to three. Only the young men must have freedom to select their studies and their teachers, at the risk of losing their degrees, which should be conditioned on satisfactory proof that they had not wholly misspent their time.

The question of greater liberty depends, in the main, upon greater maturity of mind and capacity of self-government. If the academy is to push its preparations further than it can at present, the college can shorten its term of prescribed studies, and can introduce what Dr. Hedge wishes for. We should have no objection against such a change, or rather we devoutly desire it.

As for doing away with the police and legislation of colleges, we have no doubt that, as they are at present constituted, the thing is impracticable. If you are to have chapel services and lessons or lectures, you must have decorum there. You must have order, freedom from noise on the college premises, some sort of control over moral conduct; and this control must be in the hands of college authorities, for it is found that a municipal police cannot, or will not, take this duty out of their hands. What parent is not now encouraged to trust his son in the hands of the college authorities by the belief that they are watchful over him, and that he is under their law and their eye. As for minute specifications of crimes and penalties, we have no great faith in them. Let there be no law except that all irreverence, indecorum, riot, and other violations of moral propriety shall be visited on the offender as the Faculty shall see fit, and this is as good as a long code. But even this involves legislation and police, or if not legislation, penalty, which may be the more effectual and formidable from its very vagueness. Yet, after all, the question turns on the capacity of young persons at college to govern themselves without law and inspection. Suppose the younger scholars to be only twelve years old. Could you apply to them Dr. Hedge's principles of freedom from control? When does this power of self-government begin? We should say, when they are mature enough to

be able to choose their own studies with advantage, and to guide themselves without being subject to the control of others, whenever that time may be. But the ability to choose their own studies implies a past discipline, such as or better than colleges now give; and self-control is not ordinarily reached much before the same period. We come then to this question whether a freer course of study, superadded to the present college system, would be desirable, and should pronounce, with Dr. Hedge, most positively in its favor, not only for the sake of the culture of such advanced students, but for the reaction of examples of higher attainments on the college classes.

In what we have yet to say, on a system of free study, and in defense of some such method of college education as now prevails, we shall depart in a degree from the direct consideration of Dr. Hedge's address. There is a common ground on which he and we might stand; but there are views of discipline and of education in the minds of some reformers which we regard as exceedingly pernicious.

We will not allege in opposition to a plan of free study that a place of education, to carry out the plan must be either vastly more expensive or more richly endowed than our present schools of learning are, must have a much greater number of instructors or lecturers within the same branch, as well as a greater number of branches. How many men in this country are competent to teach Anglo-Saxon, Sanscrit, or Russian? How many could at this moment teach Italian as it ought to be taught, in order to serve as a discipline, with a full knowledge of its grammar according to the researches of Dietz, and of its early literature and history. The teaching profession must be greatly subdivided and greatly improved throughout, and the institutions of learning be greatly increased in wealth, if a wide plan of free studies could be pursued to advantage.

We will also admit that the discipline of many studies might be rendered much more rigid, and that a simple study pursued on a broad scale might profitably occupy all the time and thought now devoted to many. Even the modern languages, the study of which, as now pursued, places no great difficulties before the mind, nor tries its powers in any high degree, may

be so taught that the student will not be able to pass over his task half asleep,—not to say that there are some books like Dante, written before the period of modern style, or abounding with historical allusions or profound thought, which are as hard to interpret as Æschylus or Persius. Take the first line of the *Inferno*, and let a thorough philological system be pursued: *nel mezzo* come first, words perfectly clear, but how much lore may be gathered around them. The first presents to us, for instance, the birth of the article in the Romanic languages, and its coalescence with the preposition. The other brings before us the transition from the Latin *d* to the modern *z* effected under the influence of the succeeding *i*, one of the countless number of changes, extending even into our own language, to which the same representative of sound, when following many of the mutes, has given rise. Would an advocate of the new method have this minute philology introduced into the study of the modern languages? If so, the discipline would be good no doubt, but it is the same which runs through our Greek, and in a measure our Latin training now, and for which that training capacitates us. If he would not, how much discipline can we expect from this class of languages? Very little, we think, in comparison with the discipline now gained in the study of Greek and Latin.

But supposing instructors of ability provided for an enlarged number of departments, and a rigid method introduced into all branches of science, there are several points to be determined before a reasonable man can abandon a system which has been on the whole somewhat successful. We are disposed in urging these considerations, not to do so with intolerance or fanaticism; we see but partial success—often very small success—in our present college education, and would by no means stifle fair discussion; but certain positions we are compelled to take and defend, until dislodged from them by considerations more weighty than the hopes or the denunciations of the reformers.

One of these is, that a college student is not in a condition to choose what branch of learning he shall pursue. This, we think, no one will deny, if it is asserted of students at their entrance or during the first two years of a college life. They

may indeed at their entrance have reached on the average the age of eighteen years, but very many are younger, and those who are older, as a general thing, are most completely unable to take a rational survey of the various branches of knowledge, and to say what is best fitted for their especial natures, and for the highest development of their powers. Nor are their parents competent to judge for them on any rational principles. In the end, the choice will depend on whim, or will be controlled by some officer of the college. This seems to us to be a point of no small importance. If the college could be exalted into a university proper, in such a sense that the students who enter it were qualified to enter upon some special study, as if it were a profession for life; if they were qualified to choose the one or two best adapted to their genius or want of genius; if in short the preparatory school would or could carry its pupils so far forward that the discipline of the college would no longer be needed—yes, no longer be needed, even to unlearn; if there could be a general pushing forward and displacement, so that the academy could cover half or three-quarters of the college life, and the college stretch its discipline as much farther on than it does now,—in a state of things like this, the college system might be altered; but until this shall happen, we see evils that would frighten us back from such reform as is sometimes recommended. We will say, however, as we have said once before, that we should rejoice heartily if the field of the academy could be advanced, and the division of labor between it and the college be readjusted.

Another consideration of no small weight in our view is, that no student, in training for the work of life, ought to be kept under the influence of one or two studies only. This runs back to the old doctrine, unshaken as yet, we suppose, in the minds of all practical teachers, that discipline is to be mainly aimed at in the earlier years of education, while knowledge is of minor importance; that he who has a disciplined mind can now pursue any or all knowledge with success and dispatch, while he who has not can neither acquire knowledge well nor use it to advantage; and that several classes of studies must concur in their influences, in order to prevent the formation of a one-sided mind. Experience confirms this view. The

training of the English schools is too exclusively classical. West Point is thought to give the best mathematical training this country affords, yet there are many who think that, although the influences of other studies lend their aid in some degree, the main result is a one-sided one, as indeed in a certain sense it would naturally be, on account of the professional aim in view. And so, when a young man goes into the study of law or medicine or theology without a good preparatory training, will he not ordinarily be found to make an incomplete or a narrow man. Is not especially the state of the medical profession such as to demand reform at once, where three years' training converts into a doctor of medicine a youth from the plough or the woods, who knows almost nothing, who knows neither how to think, nor how to express himself, nor how to observe.

A so-called reform in college study would overthrow the present predominance of the classical and mathematical studies in favor of the natural sciences and the modern languages. Here the plea is for the most part a practical one. The old system was good enough for training, but had no contents. All might be forgotten, and ordinarily was forgotten, as the boy became a man. The physical sciences, however, contain an amount of knowledge beyond measure great, while the modern languages are instruments of communication with the world of the present, and unlock the chambers where the business, the political relations—in short, all the art, taste, science of mankind are stored up. Better to read Homer in Lord Derby's version, or Plato in Cousin's, than to plod on through long years, catching glimpses of the antique world from half-understood Greek, at the expense of all power to catch hold of the present.

We have several considerations to oppose to this over valuation as it seems to us of the exclusively modern world. Two of them are confined to the studies of the languages. Of these, the more practical one is, that a good discipline under the ancient languages, especially under the Latin, places the acquisition of the modern, and above all of the Romanic languages within a young person's easy reach. Suppose five years to be mainly devoted to the study of language; we have little

doubt that if three of them are given to Latin and Greek, the three principal modern tongues of Romanic Europe can be learned as well in two years as they could have been in the five, if no acquaintance with the Latin had preceded. And the reason of this lies in the superior discipline afforded by those languages of the ancient times, more than in the fact that the vocabulary and grammar of the modern daughters of the Latin are to a considerable extent drawn from it. It is on the difference of thinking and expression between the old world and ours, that the greater discipline, the greater trial and exercise of the faculties in learning a language depends. The modern world in Christian lands thinks and writes very much in one way; even the Germans have modern minds, although their language is harder to acquire than those of most other European nations. The difficulties to be overcome in Latin thus smooth the way afterwards, and the succeeding task of learning a language of modern times is rendered far easier.

Another thing worthy to be taken into account is, that the study of the ancient languages forms a connection in the mind of the student between the ancient and the modern periods. The mathematical sciences have no connection with the world at all. The physical and natural, with the exception of geology, contain almost nothing of a historical character. We need for the highest purposes of life, for instance that we may be in a condition to judge of the evidences of religion and to understand its nature the better, to come into contact with antiquity, to be able to estimate its spirit, its wants, its actual civilization, to know something of the world before Christ and the world without Christ. Not only is the key to this furnished by ancient literature, but the study of the works of those ages creates a conception in our minds of the state and progress of mankind which is of use for our culture in the highest sense. Not only is the judgment exercised by the continual habit of estimating probabilities in the combinations of words and of sentences, but the world itself opens to our eyes and becomes more apprehensible; we can trace its plan better, and see a Providence working out its redemption.

As for the mathematical studies which some would abandon for the sake of the physical, we suppose that few teachers

would consent to such a loss in discipline. Pursued by themselves, they would involve some amount of injury to the habits of thought, but the united training by means of demonstrative and probable truth prevents this evil, and the benefits of this kind of study are so great and so manifest, that they are likely to maintain their ground forever in the education of the scholar.

The study of history deserves some attention by itself. To pursue merely a course of reading in this branch of knowledge we must pronounce—much as we value historical studies—to be no discipline, except so far as all knowledge is a discipline, and so far as it connects us in a poor kind of way with the remote past. To study history independently, examining testimonies and entering into the spirit of the age by the help of all its monuments and records, is a task demanding good if not high attainments in philology to begin with, and a maturity of mind which few collegians have reached. To trace the history of civilization, to behold the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them from the beginning as on a map, with their contributions to the improvement of mankind, and the higher kingdoms of human thought, with the influences under which they grew, is a noble, but, we fear, a dry study, and one not likely to be selected by those who have the power of choice. In fine, we are of opinion that historical study would consist chiefly of reading the most accessible books, which could be done as well on a sofa as by a table.

A large part of the projected reforms in the curriculum of our schools proceeds then, if we are not deceived, from an overestimate of the value of knowledge in education, and an underestimate of the value of training. Yet we are free to confess that the results of a college education are by no means satisfactory, that few good scholars are to be found, that a large part of the students have made but slender attainments in the knowledge even of those books and those branches to which the most time is allotted. The colleges cannot be materially improved, unless there is a reform above and below them, unless the academies are all as thorough as some few are, and unless the work of professional life and the prospects of success in professional life demand higher scholarship. If a rigid exami-

nation for degrees, or some system which would test the acquisitions of the students more thoroughly at the end of their course, could be adopted, and the same facilities existed as at present for the ignorant and incompetent to enter into professional life, nothing material could be gained; or if none were admitted from the academies but scholars of the first grade, nothing again would be gained so long as there are side-cuts—*shun-pikes*, to use an expressive but monstrous word in vulgar use—which avoid a college education. All the departments of education must move forward together. If one department undertakes to go faster or in a different line from the rest, it defeats its own ends. It makes a few scholars it is proud of, amid many who can hardly be called scholars. It is this ill-success which discourages college men and encourages reformers, the evil lying all the while not in the studies pursued or even in the teaching, although that is often indifferent, but in the feelings and habits of the country, in its standard of excellence, in the ease with which a poor education can fit a person for and can help him to reach the best posts of society. Perhaps the reformers can remedy the evils in a slight degree. If so, let them try. They cannot succeed certainly without a more rigorous training than now prevails. But let some college contract its course to three years or even to two years of enforced study, and then hold out inducements to students residing within its walls for two years after this, to attain to excellence in certain branches of knowledge, two at least of which branches shall be pursued by every such person; let no one have the privilege of remaining for these two years who has not attained a certain rank of excellence in the previous stage; let no one remain who cannot show that he is faithful and successful at frequent examinations; and let the expenses of such a voluntary course be not greater than those of the earlier course. Let this be done, and prove a success, and we will go over to the side of the reformers. Only they must promise that discipline of the mind must be placed first in their estimate of the value of education, and knowledge, with immediate ends in life be put in the background.

ARTICLE VI.—PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S TOUR, AND HIS POLICY.

THE ostensible design of the recent journey of President Johnson was to pay honor to the memory of Stephen A. Douglas. Mr. Douglas has no title to reverential or grateful remembrance. Among all the public men who have figured prominently within the last few years, he was, perhaps, the most mischievous and dangerous. A sharp, logical intellect, an energetic will, a restless ambition, with an abundant stock of audacity, were his leading characteristics. His moral sentiments were feeble; at any rate they exerted no perceptible influence upon his public conduct. The general cast of his mind, as well as the style of his manners, and the truculent tone which he adopted in his speeches, fitted him to represent the lower tendencies of American society, and to draw after him a large following. Nothing prevented him from reaching the goal of his ambition but the invincible jealousy and repugnance of the Southern leaders whom he had done his best to conciliate. The name of Mr. Douglas is identified with only one highly important public measure, and that was one of the most iniquitous measures for which our national Legislature has ever made itself responsible. He led in the movement for the repeal of the Missouri compromise. He pretended that he considered the provision for the exclusion of slavery, which was contained in that compromise, unconstitutional, although he had himself moved to extend the Missouri line to the Pacific. He also pretended, likewise against his own virtual declarations, as well as against all evidence, that the Missouri restriction was contrary to the spirit of the compromises of 1851. After all, he had not the manliness to give a distinct, unambiguous character to his own boasted doctrine of "squatter sovereignty." The people of a territory, he affirmed, have a right to legalize or exclude slavery; but whether that right belongs to the people prior to their act of forming a State Government, whether, during the territorial condition, slavery is

protected or prevented by the Constitution of the United States, were questions which he evaded, and which, when driven to a corner, he flatly refused to answer. They were judicial questions, he said, and must be determined by the Supreme Court. They *were* determined, as all our readers know, in the Dred Scot case. The truth is that Mr. Douglas dared not set himself against the Southerners by giving such an interpretation to his "great principle of self-government," as would allow to freedom a fair chance. He lent himself to the conspiracy for making Kansas a slave State, and stood by President Pierce in all his shameful endeavors to secure the dominion of the invading "border ruffians" over the actual settlers of that territory. Only after a usurping and therefore illegal legislature had called a convention doubly illegitimate, and that convention had refused to submit to the people the constitution which it framed, but only the question whether other slaves besides those already in the territory might be introduced, did Mr. Douglas falter in his allegiance to the pro-slavery party. But in the meantime a very significant event had occurred. Mr. Douglas had been set aside at the Democratic convention held at Cincinnati in 1856, and the more timid and supple Buchanan had been nominated for the Presidency. How far the subsequent course of Douglas was influenced by this fact, we do not undertake to determine. For his opposition to the Lecompton constitution, let him have whatever credit he deserves. It stands recorded in history that he was instrumental in overthrowing the ancient, righteous policy of excluding slavery from the territories of the Union, and in introducing a delusive theory of popular sovereignty, which he curtailed, at the behest of slavery, to the smallest proportions. The vehemence of his attacks upon all who resisted his flagitious movement for the repeal of the Missouri compromise must be fresh in the recollection of many. When three thousand ministers of New England, among whom were such names as Jeremiah Day and Lyman Beecher, sent in their protest against the Nebraska act, it will be remembered how coarsely and violently Mr. Douglas assailed them, seizing on the pretext afforded by the circumstance that the petition happened to reach the Senate three or four days after the bill had passed that body, although it had not yet gone through the

House, and therefore had not become a law. "They know not what they are talking about;" "they ought to be rebuked, and required to confine themselves to their vocation;" "they have followed the lead of a circular which was issued by the abolition confederates in this body,"—such are some of the elegant phrases in Mr. Douglas's speech. When the secession movement began, Mr. Douglas, though smarting under the reiterated proofs of ingratitude which he had experienced at the hands of the South, was ready for a compromise. He had not the moral courage to come out for coercion, though at first he was inclined to do so. He sat and heard with apparent approbation the speech of his intimate political associate, Mr. Pugh, who to the extreme delight of Davis, Toombs, and the other conspirators, argued at great length against the right of the government forcibly to repress the coming rebellion. If the cause of the country at that eventful crisis had possessed no firmer and bolder friends than Mr. Douglas, ruin would have befallen us. As far as human foresight can judge, his removal from the earth at the time when it occurred, was a happy event for the country. It is impossible to say what that restless, aspiring, audacious politician might not have chosen to do, had he lived to witness the vicissitudes through which we were obliged to pass in the course of the war. He had more power for evil than any other, while his character and previous history contained no guarantee that evil would not be his choice. We might pass over the career of Mr. Douglas in charitable silence, but when there is a call for peculiar tokens of respect for his memory, we are justified in expressing the opinion that an impartial judgment will pronounce him better entitled to reprobation than to honor. The higher qualities of a Christian statesman did not belong to him; the essential qualities of a gentleman he wholly lacked.

The ostensible motive of the President's tour was, therefore, one that does him no credit. But the President and Secretary of State had a different end in view. Their journey to Mr. Douglas's tomb was like Mr. Douglas's famous journey in quest of his mother. It was an electioneering tour, elaborately devised by Mr. Johnson and Mr. Seward for the purpose of kindling popular enthusiasm in behalf of their new-fledged party.

It is not the first example of a shrewd scheme for managing men, which disappoints its inventors. The dignitaries who planned this expedition may reflect for their consolation, that they are not the first victims of disappointed hope. Community in grief, Cicero assures us, is a great solace; and the same truth is expressed in a more homely way in the axiom, "misery loves company." If it is not considered disrespectful to our rulers, we commend to them the familiar lines of Burns:—

The best laid schemes o' mice and men
Gang aft a-gley;
An' lea'e us naught but grief and pain,
For promised joy.

A journey undertaken with the design to break down the patriotic Republican party, and build up on its ruins a new party to be composed of the enemies of the country and its lukewarm friends—a party that would be sure to use all its power in undoing the great work of the last five years,—deserved to come to shame.

The arrangements for this tour were not less discreditable than the motive of it. General Grant and Admiral Farragut, the two foremost heroes of the war, were requested to accompany the President; and such a request from a superior officer they did not feel at liberty to decline. They were to form the tail of the kite. The well-earned respect which they command was to be feloniously appropriated to aid the political scheme of Mr. Johnson and Mr. Seward. The result showed that the American people are intelligent enough to make proper distinctions even among persons who travel in the same company. The deportment of General Grant and Admiral Farragut was such as to lend no help to the political plotters who had harnessed them to their car. Nothing can be more diverting than the quiet observation of General Grant when he appeared upon the balcony where Mr. Johnson had been storming for half an hour on the frightful dangers impending over the country. "I have been taking a nap since this began," was the remark of the taciturn General. This great organization of clap-trap for carrying captive the people, signally failed.

But neither the real nor the pretended design of the tour, nor the arrangement respecting Grant and Farragut have in-

flicted a title of the disgrace upon the leading civilians of the party, which their own demeanor has inflicted. As far as Mr. Johnson is concerned, his previous speeches had not inspired the public with very glowing anticipations. But it is generally agreed that, during his tour, in his intemperate abuse of "the Radicals," in violent attacks upon the Legislative branch of the government, and in tedious self-laudation, he has fairly outdone himself. Yet the wrathful harangues of Mr. Johnson are scarcely more mortifying than Mr. Seward's poor attempts at facetiousness. The former may lay claim to a coarse kind of earnestness. But it would be no compliment to Mr. Seward to charge him with sincerity in his praise of Mr. Johnson, whom he styles, we observe, "the second Cato." Mr. Seward is lamentably deficient in what a recent writer styles "the enthusiasm of humanity." He has done great service in advocating human rights, yet has never succeeded in drawing to himself any feeling of warm veneration. The heroic qualities of human character nature has denied him. He has never been able to forget himself in a whole-souled devotion to a noble cause. He stands intellectually upon the border ground that separates the statesman and the mere politician, so that one is ever at a loss in which category to rank him. From the time that he was set aside at Chicago by the first convention that nominated Mr. Lincoln, his course has excited constant distrust among his former friends and supporters. Through the whole war we have never felt sure of him. Men not prone to suspicion have feared that he was hatching some project of compromise, spinning some baneful intrigue. It is unfortunate for a man of so much talent to instinctively prefer a crooked path to a straight one. As he grows old, he over-estimates his powers of management. He puts an increasingly low estimate upon moral forces. The interest of the hour sways his conduct. He makes an idol of expediency. Yet for many years Mr. Seward fought a good fight. For his own fame, not less than for the common good, it is to be lamented that he did not finish his course in the same line of honorable service. Seeing this man, once the recognized leader of the party of freedom, and unusually observant of the proprieties of public station, striving now to pull down the edifice which he has helped to

build, and acting the part of a jester in the late excursion of the President, we involuntarily revert to the familiar lines of Johnson, in the "Vanity of Human Wishes :"—

"From Marlborough's eyes the streams of dotage flow,
And Swift expires, a driveler and a show."

The defection of leaders of the Republican party has served to bring out in bold relief the intelligence and firmness of the party itself. The country has been instructed by the tremendous struggle through which it has passed. The people are determined not to be cheated out of the fruits of the war, now that so great a price has been paid for them. However intrenched an individual may be in their regard, his influence is gone the moment that he falters on this vital point. Even Mr. Beecher, a sincere, noble, and courageous man, when he is betrayed by his over trustful temperament and constitutional good-nature, into the advocacy of a hasty, unsafe reconstruction, finds himself without a following. This clear perception of the character of the crisis on the part of the body of the people augurs well for the future.

But we have no wish to dwell on the personal characteristics of President Johnson and his leading advisers. There are two great topics which demand notice, the character of the President's reconstruction policy, and the gross usurpation of authority by which he would seem disposed to force it upon the country.

All know the difficulty which has been experienced in settling the exact theory on which the war should be prosecuted. The Seceders and their Northern allies maintained that there is no power of coercion, and hence no power of self-preservation, in the Federal Government. If a State chose to withdraw from the Union, even if it were held that such an act of secession is without law, it was claimed that there is no remedy in the hands of the National government. The country might fall to pieces, but no one was authorized to lift an arm to save it. This was virtually the ground taken by Mr. Buchanan in his last annual message. The views of Mr. Johnson and his abettors relative to the position of the rebel communities at

the close of the war, are of a piece with that suicidal theory which the loyal people of the country indignantly rejected. When the arms of the rebels have been wrested from their hands, we are told that the country is disabled from protecting itself by excluding them from political power, but is bound to permit these same rebel communities, instantly, and without conditions, to resume their place in the general government. There are legal difficulties, we are assured, in the way of any other course. Either their independence must be allowed or their privileges at once restored. The anti-coercion theory, and the theory of Mr. Johnson agree in leaving the country without a shield against its enemies.

In opposition to Mr. Johnson's theory, we affirm that the inhabitants dwelling south of a line which was defined in the declaration of Congress fixing the boundaries of the war, were by their own act of insurrection, the belligerent enemies of the United States, who were still liable indeed to punishment by municipal law, but also subject, if overcome, to all the penalties imposed by the just laws of war upon conquered enemies. We affirm that *de facto*, though not *de jure*, they carried their States out of the Union, and as political communities combined together to levy war against it. Thus, at the close of the war, the inhabitants of the belligerent territory found themselves, to use the language of Mr. Johnson himself, "deprived of all civil government." Their States had ceased to exist in an organized form. They had destroyed the governments which had connected them with the Federal Union, and the governments which they had set up had been destroyed by the Federal authority. There lay the territory within the limits and under the power of the Union. There were the inhabitants, subjugated by the military force of the Union, and exposed to the penalty of treason as well as to the consequences laid down in the rules of civilized warfare. It is true that there were loyal individuals in each of the seceding States who never voluntarily submitted to the rebellion; but in each of those States they were comparatively a handful. Such persons are of course exempt from personal responsibility for action in which they took no part, and deserve all the rewards of faithfulness which the National Government can properly bestow.

But they must share in the consequences of the act of the political community of which they are a part, so far as these consequences affect its position as a political body. The acts of secession, we repeat, must be looked upon as done by the rebel States, not righteously, not legally, but actually. It is just as idle to attempt to regard their action as void of all effect upon their political status, as it would be to consider a house as actually standing because the fire that consumed it was the lawless work of an incendiary. The inhabitants of the revolted States were left by the war without State governments. This is conceded by Mr. Johnson himself. Now, is the National Government bound to reinstate those States, and restore them to their former privileges in the family? If so, by what obligation? We deny the existence of such an obligation. We do not at this moment inquire what is the best course to be taken, what is politic; we consider now only the rights in the case. Over the people who constituted these political communities, who went out of the Union *de facto*, made war upon it in their organized character, the National Government has the right of the conqueror. What if Mexico, seizing upon a favorable moment, should make a causeless and cruel war upon the United States, and should be defeated by a prodigious exertion of force on our part—all know that we should have the right to dispose of the hostile people, and of their territory, in such a way as to secure ourselves for the future. It might, for example, be found requisite to appropriate their territory. Whence could our government derive this right? Not from any specific clause of the Constitution; but it is a right inherent in every government,—the right to redress a wrong, and deprive the aggressor of the means of doing evil. This is an established doctrine of international law. But this doctrine is equally applicable in the case of a gigantic insurrection which sets a whole country in flames. The fact that it is a civil war does not tie the hands of the victor, and rob him of the right of self-protection at the moment when force has given him the supremacy, and he has succeeded in disarming his adversary. International law is a science of justice and common sense. “*Dum ratio manet, lex manet.*” It is a dictate of reason that the same rule should apply to a

civil contest, which, as in the case of the late struggle, assumes the character of a territorial war. As far as the *right* is concerned, we are authorized to dispose of the rebel confederation, including their territory and the rebel inhabitants, as we may judge necessary for the future security of the country. We may forbid the resuscitation of the States which were *de facto* carried out of the Union; we may permit the rehabilitation of some, and deny this privilege in the case of others; we may divide or combine them anew, changing their boundaries; we may do with them, in short, whatever the public good and the safety of the country require. This right belongs to the government, because it *is* a government; and there is no more need of an explicit clause in the Constitution to warrant its exercise, than there would be, in the case before supposed, for the reduction of Mexico to provinces, or the occupation of its territory under some other system of administration. It is absurd, and a gross affront to common sense, to assert that those political communities must either be actually making war upon the nation, or else taking an equal part in its government.

It will be said that our view of the matter is inconsistent with a resolution of Congress, which declared that the war was not waged for purposes of conquest or subjugation. The war, it will be said, was actually carried forward on a different theory. We reply that the resolution of Congress may be taken as a declaration of policy, and not as a limitation of right. As a declaration of policy even, its force is weakened, if not annulled, by the stubborn refusal of the rebels to avail themselves of the hope which it held out to them, in case they should voluntarily return to their allegiance. They chose to fight it out to the last; and yielding only to force, they have no right to make their appeal to such a declaration. It involves no pledge to them, nothing of the nature of a contract which the nation is bound to fulfill. The rebels gave up not until resistance was no longer possible; and hence they are debarred, and their attorneys for them, from insisting upon that interpretation of the war which happens to be advantageous to them in their present situation. Had they found in that interpretation an inducement to abandon their criminal enterprise, then they might, perhaps, have founded on it some claim. In truth,

however, no uniform interpretation of the character of the war has prevailed. It was made by the act of Congress a territorial war. The Supreme Court applied to it the rules which govern an international contest. We hold that the nation is free to act as it deems best with reference to its subdued enemies, and that we are not restricted by any past professions to which they have a right to appeal.

While we hold that the powers of the Government in the settlement of this contest are thus extensive, we agree that sound policy dictates the resuscitation and restoration of the rebel States. We only claim that this is a measure not of legal obligation, but of clemency. It is agreed, then, on all hands that the Southern States are still to exist, and that their governments are to be reconstructed. And here we lay down the proposition that the National Government is empowered to prescribe the method of this reorganization, and on what conditions it shall be considered complete and valid. Take the case of South Carolina. There is a community, within the limits of the United States, but having no other government. The State Government has been destroyed by the act of the inhabitants in connection with their rebellion against the national authority. The mass of those inhabitants who formerly possessed political power, are not only conquered belligerents, but are liable to be tried, convicted, and punished for treason and other crimes. Moreover, more than half of the entire population have passed from a condition of servitude to freedom, and to the enjoyment of equal civil rights. Is it not plain that the terms and conditions on which the nation will recognize an organization calling itself a State government in this community, must be determined by the nation itself? What classes of inhabitants shall take part in the formation of that new government to hold the place of the government extinguished by the rebellion? What security shall be given that this new organization will not become another instrument for inflicting measureless wrongs and evils upon our common country? What guarantees shall be afforded against a repetition of secession and rebellion, or against less open attacks upon the nation, such as attacks upon its financial credit? It

snrely belongs to the victorious party, to the loyal States, to the national authorities, to determine these questions. This follows from the fact that the bulk of the inhabitants in the disloyal communities are vanquished enemies and subdned rebels, and that those States are no longer in "practical relations with the Union." The opposite doctrine is a political absurdity. It is the doctrine that a State may at any time go out of the Union (*de facto*) for hostile purposes, and, having done all the mischief in its power, may come back again at any moment, and on its own terms. In going out of the Union it violates, as a civil community, a sacred compact, and is liable to all the consequences of so perfidious an act. This proposition implies no sanction of the *right* of secession; it asserts the opposite; but it does admit the *power* of secession. And who can deny that for four years the Southern States were *actually* out of the Union by the act of their own will?

We are saved from the necessity of arguing for the right of the National Government to impose conditions upon the rebel communities, by Mr. Johnson's practical admissions. He required of the Conventions, which he caused to be assembled in the Southern States, that they should disown the rebel debt, and give their assent to the anti-slavery amendment of the Constitution. He himself imposed conditions upon them. He required of them such stipulations as he thought it best to require. In doing this he fully admitted the right for which we now contend.

In a case like the present, political guarantees in the shape of Constitutional Amendments, which are practically irrevocable, are of the highest consequence. We have always supposed that the mass of the population which was engaged in the rebellion must ultimately regain political power. It would neither be wise nor feasible to exclude them permanently from this privilege, constituting, as they do, nearly the whole population in the disloyal States. But just for the reason that we regard this liberal policy as destined to prevail, and as, on the whole, wise, do we insist on the necessity of extorting sufficient guarantees which shall stand in the Constitution as a perpetual defense against the possible consequences of such clemency. There is imperative need that the legitimate results of the war

should be thus secured, and the future safety of the country be guarded. Stipulations of the nature described, when incorporated in the fundamental law, are invaluable. They may, perhaps, be disregarded for a season, since it is impossible to find an infallible safeguard against human passion; but they are likely to prove effectual for their end. Once established, they will not be allowed to become a dead letter. We are aware that a logical difficulty is raised in relation to the validity of the assent, which is given by the conventions in the rebel States, to the amendments of the Constitution. It is urged that if they have not their privileges as members of the Union, they are incompetent to give this ratification, while, if they have their privileges, it cannot be extorted. We attach little force to this objection. For, in the first place, a ratification of these amendments on their part is equivalent to a re-acceptance of the Constitution of the United States with these additions, and is part and parcel of their act of restoration to the Union. In the second place, we believe that a ratification of such amendments by three fourths of the loyal States is sufficient to give them validity. The disloyal States would have no more ground of complaint than they have against the passage of the same amendments by two-thirds of a Congress in which they are not represented. In both cases they are disabled from acting by their own act and fault. If they choose to sunder their practical relations to the Union, the operations of the Government are not to be thereby blocked. The United States are still competent to carry on their government, and, if they see fit, to amend their Constitution. If, during the existence of the war, the loyal people of the country had felt it desirable to alter the Constitution in some particulars, would they have been precluded from doing so by the inability of the rebel States to act in the matter? We trow not. Of what value, then, it may be asked, is such a ratification on the part of the communities not yet restored to their privileges as States? We reply,—“much, every way.” Not all adopt the view which we have just set forth, as to the competency of the loyal States themselves to amend the Constitution. Moreover, such a ratification by the rebel States is equivalent to a solemn stipulation. It debars them from ever calling in question the

validity of such amendments. They come back into the Union with a pledge of acquiescence in these changes. They consent to them, even if their consent is not strictly requisite to give them validity.

The National Government is master of the situation. It has the power and the right to prescribe to the rebel communities the conditions of readmission to the privileges of States in the American Union. The next question is, to which branch of the Government does the exercise of this power and right peculiarly belong? It pertains, we answer, to the Legislative Department. The first Section of the first Article of the Constitution provides that "all Legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and a House of Representatives." The Executive can recommend measures to the "consideration" of Congress; he possesses a qualified veto with respect to the enactments of that body; and in case of a disagreement between the two Houses as to the time of their adjournment, he is authorized "to adjourn them to such time as he shall think proper." This is the limit of his influence on the legislation of the country. Moreover, he is liable to impeachment for treason, bribery, and other high crimes and misdemeanors. For all such offenses he can be arraigned by the House of Representatives before the Senate, and this body, the Chief Justice presiding, is competent, by a vote of two-thirds of the members present, to depose him from his office, to disqualify him from ever again holding any office under the United States, and to hand him over to the courts for "indictment, trial, judgment, and punishment, according to law." Such are the bounds which the Constitution has set to the powers of the Executive; so stringently has it guarded against usurpation, on his part, of the functions which are lodged elsewhere. When the civil war has been brought to a close by the overthrow of the enemy, the terms of settlement fall within the proper scope of legislative action. A strong analogy to the work of reconstruction is presented in the process of converting territories into States. In either case a State government is to be formed where none exists. In the instance of a territory aspiring to

the privileges of a State, the usual and regular course of procedure is for Congress to pass an "enabling act," authorizing given classes of inhabitants, which are designated in the act, to choose a convention, and form a Constitution. After this instrument has been framed, it is submitted to Congress for their approval, and if it is found to be satisfactory, the applicant is admitted to the rank of a State. We bring forward this example for the purpose of showing that the business of admitting, or readmitting States, pertains especially to the Legislative Branch. If we turn to the precise question before us, it will be evident that the Executive has no powers, under the Constitution, in the matter of reconstruction, except war powers. He may establish a military government over a revolted district; he may appoint provisional governors who are clothed with military authority. But when hostilities are at an end, and the time has come for supplanting military by civil rule, his control in the revolted States expires. He has no authority qualifying him to declare who shall, and who shall not, take part in the formation of new State Governments. Neither is he empowered to dictate what sort of a constitution shall be formed, or what further action the convention, when once assembled, shall take. We do not object to his offering suggestions and recommendations. He may invite the people in such a community to enter on the work of reconstructing the local government, and he may advise them as to the steps which he deems best for them to take. But the government which they may form under his auspices is experimental in its character; it cannot demand a recognition from Congress. Nothing that is done in the business is of any force until Congress shall have given it force by an express act of recognition.

From this statement, the nature and extent of the President's usurpation of authority are evident. He has insisted that the organizations which have been created by his agency in the Southern States, shall be deemed, to all intents and purposes, State governments; and he has required that Congress shall limit itself to the examination of the personal qualifications of the individuals who derive their credentials, as Representatives or Senators, from these organizations. This work

must be done, he consistently demands, by each House for itself. He has thus aimed to take the whole work of reconstruction and restoration out of the hands of Congress, where it rightfully belongs. Congress, with great wisdom and propriety, judged that the readmission of the seceded State, and the recognition of the new government in it, were the work first in order; and that this work belonged to Congress as a whole, and not to either house acting separately. The appointment of the Joint Committee of fifteen was the legitimate consequence of this position.

Thus President Johnson stands before the country in the character of an unsuccessful usurper of powers that do not belong to him. In the prosecution of his indefensible policy, he has gone so far as to question, in the most insulting and offensive terms, the right of the present Congress to legislate upon any subject, alleging as a reason the continued exclusion of representatives from the rebel communities. He has dared to characterize Congress as a body pretending or assuming to be a congress, as hanging on the verge of the government, as a Congress not of the United States, but only of a part of the States. His violent invectives against Congress have indeed come down upon his own pate; but they ought not on this account to be passed over lightly. Should he continue these revolutionary and outrageous assaults upon the Legislative Branch of the Government, we trust that he will be brought before the bar of the Senate to answer for his misdemeanors. He richly deserves to be impeached; and we firmly believe that, if he perseveres in his course, the people who have carried this great war to a glorious termination, will have the energy and courage to bring him to a condign punishment. It is to be hoped that he will take warning in time, and save the country from the necessity of deposing a Chief Magistrate.

Ever since this long struggle began, a mischievous influence has been conceded to legal quibbles. The first movers of secession proposed to destroy a great Government, and break a powerful nation in pieces—all according to law. South Carolina pretended to reclaim the Federal territory within her limits and on her border, by the right of eminent domain.

The United States were to be robbed of their forts, arsenals, and custom-houses, by a strictly legal process. It took Mr. Buchanan and his Cabinet a long time to discover that the United States held such property as a sovereign, by right of dominion, and not as a private proprietor. Then each Southern State was to be made independent by a brief but most lawful process, simply by the vote of a convention revoking the original acceptance of the National Constitution. We happen to know that Jefferson Davis intended to get possession of the city of Washington, in like manner, by due process of law. It was a settled principle, he said, that a gift which is no longer available to the uses designated by the donor, reverts to him. Now Maryland was to secede; and Maryland and Virginia being out of the Union, Washington could no longer be used for a capital of the United States. It must revert to the States which originally granted it. By them it could be given to the new Confederacy. We doubt not that the knavish lawyers who managed the Southern Confederacy could have found some doctrine on which they could rest the slaughter of captive garrisons, and the starvation of prisoners. The good cause has also suffered from the operation of a perverse casuistry. There was an absurd fear, at the outset, in regard to the exchange of prisoners, as if the conceding of certain belligerent privileges involved the resigning, in case of our success, the right to deal with our enemies as traitors to be punished by municipal law. There has been an unwillingness to look upon the rebellion as anything but the act of individuals; as if the acknowledgment of the plain fact that the war was waged by the Southern States in their corporate capacity, carried with it some admission of the legal validity of secession. Now there is a ready casuistry by which the President and his political friends would tie the hands of the victor, and give free room to the spirit of rebellion, which threatens to transfer itself from the field of battle to the halls of legislation. It is high time to treat this momentous subject on the broad principles of common sense, which are, also, the real principles of public law.

There are two modes of feeling in respect to our late war, and much depends on which of them is adopted. Some are disposed to ignore, as far as possible, the whole contest. All dis-

cussion of the merits of it, they think, should be given up. If the rebellion involved crime in its supporters, that crime is to be buried in oblivion. We are not to assume that we were in the right, and the insurgents in the wrong. If the gallantry of our soldiers is to be praised, care must be taken to give equal credit to the armies of the rebellion. No open allusion to the great conflict must be made, except as "a state of unpleasantness" which we have all to deplore and remember no longer. Now we agree that, as far as practicable, hard words should be spared. But there are some difficulties in the line of policy just described. The prime difficulty is that such a course is *contrary to the truth*. The rebellion was either a most iniquitous movement, or it was righteous. The subduing of it was either a sin or a glorious achievement, ever to be remembered with joy and with gratitude to Heaven. Justice to the martyrs in this terrible war forbids us to pass over in silence their heroic services. They are to be honored and praised, and wherever they lie, monuments should be raised to them. It is a wrong done to their memory when the cause for which they gave their lives is spoken of with bated breath, lest somebody should be offended, and when their deeds must be hushed up. Let there be no ignoble boasting over a prostrate enemy. Let there be forbearance and kindness. But let us not act as if we were ashamed of our conduct. Let us not act as if we were not the victors, but the vanquished. And when, in Congress or elsewhere, a voice is raised in defense of this rebellion, or in accusation of those who put it down, let there be an instant, overwhelming rebuke. With such sentiments concerning the general subject of the war, we shall not be likely to cast away the proper fruits of it by a pusillanimous yielding to new menaces, or by a blind, unwarranted trust. We shall firmly insist that the freedmen shall have their rights, that all who have been faithful to the Union shall be well treated, and that such political guarantees shall be given by the South as will secure the country, so far as solemn stipulations can secure it, against the recurrence of the direful evils from which we have just escaped. When that sagacious Englishman, Mr. Cobden, traveled in this country several years ago, he remarked that the Republican party was deficient in pluck. He meant what

may be called political pluck. The multitude of intelligent persons who compose this party do not lack personal courage. This has been sufficiently proved in the war. But the party has seemed to hesitate about using the power it has once gained. It has allowed too much weight to the loud, threatening talk of its opponents. It has seemed to falter at the very moment when it has least need to falter. Having carried the country in an election, a great party should fearlessly give effect to its principles, by embodying them in legislation. The so-called Democratic party has never failed to act on this maxim. The Republicans will do well to imitate their example in this particular. Let the men who talk about a "rump Congress" be given to understand that their *talk* has no further significance than to disclose their own factious, unprincipled character; but that on the instant when they venture to lift a finger in resistance to the enactments of this "rump Congress," they will be ground to powder. There can be no question that the preponderance of power in this country—of intellectual power, of moral power, and of numbers too,—is on the side of the great principles and tendencies of which the Republican party is the champion.

ARTICLE VII.—NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

THE RISE AND THE FALL; OR, THE ORIGIN OF MORAL EVIL.*—We greet this handsome volume as affording proof that the interesting and momentous problems of theological science are not yet forgotten among us. In several respects, it is a remarkable book. It is anonymous. The author gives no information respecting himself, except the introductory statement that he has followed the Horatian maxim, and kept his manuscript in his desk for nine years before sending it to the printer. He has handled an old theme with much originality and freshness, and with rare vigor and ingenuity of reasoning. An occasionally over subtle character in the argumentation, where objections are to be disposed of, might lead to the conjecture that the unknown author is connected with the legal profession; but his obvious acquaintance with theological writers, such as Julius Müller, not to speak of other peculiarities, would seem to contradict this view. The leading position taken in this volume is a novel one. It is maintained that the so-called disobedience of Adam in the garden was not a sin, but rather a voluntary act by which he chose to be a moral being and to receive the endowment of conscience, he having been, previous to that act, a perfectly formed, intellectual creature, but destitute of moral ideas and perceptions, and therefore not accountable for his conduct. Conscience was given him, partly as a regulator and governor of the appetites which he had in common with the lower animals. But this high, though perilous, gift was not thrust upon him. It was left for him to determine whether or not he would remain as he was first created, or accept the powers, together with the exposures, of a morally responsible creature. Becoming a moral being by his free act, he then allowed the passions to gain the mastery over conscience, thus falling into sin.

* *The Rise and the Fall; or, the Origin of Moral Evil.* In three parts. Part I. The suggestions of Reason. II. The disclosures of Revelation. III. The confirmations of Theology. New York: Published by Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo. pp. 311. New Haven: Judd & White. Price \$1.75.

His posterity, born like him as concerns the possession of the rival impulses of passion and duty, imitate him in yielding sway to the former—each individual for himself. By this theory, it is claimed that the ordinary objections to the doctrine of original sin are obviated, and the ways of God to man are justified. The grounds of the permission of moral evil, the author does not undertake to explain. He only assumes to free the divine administration from all reproach for harsh or unjust treatment of mankind in the matter of the origin and the diffusion of moral and physical evil. He considers that his theory is sustained by the narrative in the early chapters of Genesis, and is not opposed to the statements of Paul in the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. A considerable portion of the work is taken up with a critical examination of the history of our first parents, as it is recorded in Genesis. This passage is held to be inconsistent with the ordinary views of the fall of man, and fully to corroborate the hypothesis adopted by the author. The tree which Adam was forbidden to eat is thought to have been literally the source of the knowledge (in the sense of discovery or apprehension) of moral good and evil. Throughout the book there is a reverent spirit in reference to the Scriptures. They are made the rule of faith. The following extracts from the seventh chapter (Part I.), will afford the reader a specimen of the author's style, and also give him a further insight into the opinions advocated :

" We have inquired, in the last two chapters, whether Reason or Philosophy suggests any *improbability* that the moral faculty was conferred upon man at a period subsequent to his reception of the other mental powers. We have attempted to show that no such intrinsic improbability arises either from the nature and purposes of the moral faculty itself, or from any supposable necessity for such a faculty to man at the outset of his existence. Continuing the support of the same view, we now arrive at the third of our preceding propositions, namely,—That reasons connected with the deep *responsibilities* imposed by the moral faculty upon man, lend strong support to the supposition that his Maker would prefer to impart this faculty to him subsequently to the other mental powers, and to make its acquirement the result of man's own intelligent choice and voluntary action.

" It is universally conceded, as the basis of every theory relating to the moral system of this world, that it originated in some great act of *choice* by the progenitor or representative of the race. What was the nature, and what the effect of that choice on this representative and his posterity, have indeed been the subjects of endless discussion ; and the ordinarily received doctrines on these points, it will be generally agreed, are invested with no small difficulty. But that the present moral system was ushered in by *some* voluntary act of the first man, affecting in

some way not only himself, but all mankind after him, is recognized as not only taught by inspiration, but as consistent with reason and philosophy. Our object in these pages is to ascertain what that choice really was, and to show that instead of being what the common view represents it,—Man's deliberate descent from virtue to disobedience, sinfulness, and ruin,—it was simply his choice and reception of a moral sense, and the engrafting of the latter with its opportunities and responsibilities upon a nature previously *innocent* but ignorant of moral distinctions. In subsequent pages we shall investigate the proof which establishes the *facts*. Our present inquiry is whether such a theory is intrinsically objectionable.

"That the act of choice thus admitted to have been made by man shortly after his creation, *might* have been his adoption of a moral nature, has been shown to be at least possible in demonstrating the separability of the moral faculty, and that man *might* have been created, and for a time left without it, without any real deficiency in his mental power and dignity. This being so, what even probable reason is there to believe that it was developed in him simultaneously with his birth, especially when there seems to have been no opportunity for such development to be manifested? His other mental faculties were, indeed, created in him in a state of maturity,—ready for immediate use, because they were required to be used immediately in their full vigor and strength. So the lower animals exhibit complete, at birth, such faculties as their immediate necessities require, while the rest waken gradually into action. Had Adam had no immediate occasion for the employment of any of his intellectual powers, who shall say that they would have sprung at once from his brain in full panoply for service? Such has not been their mode of development in any instance that has occurred since our first progenitor. The infant, having no urgent need of their immediate use, is born with a mind, to all appearance blank; and waits a considerable period for its first intellectual conception,—still longer for the awakening of its *moral* capacity. The possession by Adam, to any degree, at the moment of his birth, of mental faculties active and perfect, was a miracle. Who shall say that, unlike other miracles, it was extended so far as to embrace more than necessity required?

"But the inquiry relates not merely to the *time*, but also to the *manner* of attaining this moral sense. It is not only whether man might not have acquired it subsequently to his birth, but whether his Maker might not have chosen that he should come into its possession by his own voluntary act, rather than implant it in his mind without his own consent or agency. An affirmative reply to this inquiry, we should premise, can be in no way *essential* to our argument. Should we hereafter succeed in establishing, by proof of the *fact*, that the Almighty *did* thus leave man to choose between a moral sense or not, it can be a matter of no consequence whether our reason would have suggested such a course, or can see any sufficient motive for it. At the same time, if there are any considerations why it seems a rational and natural mode of inducting man into his moral station and career, it is proper that these should be presented, to receive as much weight as they may deserve." pp. 59, 62.

* * * * *

"We have seen that a conscience, though not requisite for man's use at the outset of his existence, was yet necessary to complete his nature, as a provision

against the future dangers from passion in the coming circumstance of life. Now did the moral sense affect his state and relations in no other way than would any mere natural instinct answering the same regulating ends in the animal economy, there might be no reason why it should not be implanted in him at the outset, or subsequently, like any other endowment of nature, without his own choice or agency. But such is not the sole method or measure of its influence. In the question of its possession or non-possession, is involved the momentous scheme of moral *accountability*, by which, upon his own faltering hands, is thrown the charge of his eternal interests. Nor can we assert that this change in his situation, tremendous as it is, is all that was involved in it,—since we can have no knowledge under what conditions he might have been permitted, as an intelligent but not a moral being, to inhabit the universe. Had we definite revelation on this point, it is possible that thereby the most conclusive reasons might appear, why man's adoption of moral agency should be his own act alone. But even if it be a question of moral accountability only, does not our knowledge of the Divine character render it probable that God would devolve upon man himself the responsibility of the change, rather than force him unconsenting from a state of innocence and peace, into one of such momentous struggles and perils? one too, as the Divine prescience must have foreseen, of his certain sinfulness and woe! If not, and if we are to believe that the transition was occasioned by the act of God alone, how, in view of the certain foreknowledge just referred to, could it ever be insisted that the Almighty had no hand in the introduction, into the world, of sin and moral evil? For though it might be justly urged that man alone was guilty of the actual commission of sin, yet it would still be necessary to admit that it was the Creator's act which insured its entrance, and thrust man, an involuntary victim, into the range of its fatal allurements." pp. 63, 65.

Most of the objections to the author's opinions which would occur to a thoughtful reader are anticipated, and are considered, if not in all cases satisfactorily answered. We quote an additional passage from the first chapter of Part II.

"The exposition of these propositions under our view has been already set forth in the preceding pages. We have there seen how Adam in his original state, with grand and vigorous intellectual powers, and a soul whose want of an innate moral sense was supplied by the Divine temporary instruction and guidance, must of necessity, at least for some period of time in his early existence, have been an exalted and innocent being. That there subsisted with him, nevertheless, in full array, the slumbering appetites of his natural constitution, whose undeveloped energies required but time and opportunity to press beyond their due and beathful bounds, and, gaining the ascendancy in his being, to achieve its final overthrow. We have shown that, by the transgression, these innate tendencies were unchanged in nature or in force; that the only bearing of that act upon them was an indirect one,—that of investing their indulgence with a moral character; that this new influence or effect, however, implied in itself a radical progress in man's moral condition and relations; that by virtue of it, the undue allowance of these propensities, otherwise morally innocent, came to be sinful, and man's prevailing tendencies towards such an allowance, tendencies to evil,—influ-

ences and manifestations of corruption and depravity. That thus also all his posterity, inheriting from him these natural propensities by virtue of Adam's original animal nature, and inheriting too these moral perceptions by virtue of his moral nature acquired through the transgression, find themselves in consequence of that act influenced by inherent powerful tendencies sweeping them toward evil. How far these tendencies toward sin, arising from the native force of the passions, are strong enough to affect man's freedom of action, is a fair question for metaphysical discussion under any view, or no view, of his moral relations. That they are so powerful that no mere human being has in fact ever completely controlled them, is undisputed. But it is to be noted that He 'who was made in all points like as we are, yet without sin,' did overcome them, and we should therefore be cautious in asserting that they are absolutely irresistible. Indeed, in such an inquiry we should find it difficult to estimate the *natural* strength of our propensities, as distinguished from their *developed* strength through repeated indulgence; yet when we speak of man's inherent tendencies to evil, we must refer to the former alone. Can we be sure that these are such as to warp and determine human character with a power beyond man's capacity and control? May it not be that if he were to train his moral powers unwaveringly from infancy in the government of his passions, just as instead thereof he from the outset permits his passions to override his conscience, he might at length secure for virtue the easy and undisputed ascendancy in his soul?

"Whatever may be the *possibilities* of the case, it is certain that none of Adam's posterity have, as a matter of fact, achieved in life or in heart the entire subjection of passion to duty. As the actual result, therefore, of their moral agency, they have come to be sinners, with controlling tendencies towards sin. Here is the true 'apostasy' both of Adam and the race, their falling into sinfulness almost at once upon entering on their moral career. Let us not be understood, however, as maintaining that since the transgression man has any natural or acquired disposition toward sin for its own sake in preference to holiness. The distinction is to be observed between the indulgence of the natural propensities, and the moral character of such indulgence. It is true that man turns to gratification more readily than to resistance, yet it is not true that he therefore prefers the sin involved in it, to the virtue of abstaining. Love sin in the abstract he does not. On the contrary, he by innate instinct hates moral evil, and loves moral good. God's declaration in the garden, that he would 'put enmity' between Man and the principle of evil, has not been falsified. He blames himself for vice, and yields to it; not because he finds pleasure in the criminality, but because his appetites solicit him more effectually than his principles. It is this very truth which enhances, if indeed it does not constitute, the guilt of his act. Had he an inborn pleasure in sin for its own sake, God, who so created him, would share with him the responsibility for its choice. It is because he has these better instincts and promptings by nature, and because his Will (given him for their support) permits them on the contrary to be supplanted by abnormal passions, that he, and he alone, is held accountable for his wickedness and folly." pp. 234, 237.

We have no room for further citations, nor can we enter into a discussion of the main point in the author's theory. We simply remark that it is difficult to see how a man could intelligently

decide whether he would, or would not, have a conscience, unless he were previously possessed of a just conception of conscience,—possessed, that is to say, of moral ideas and feelings; and it is also evident that the author's exegesis labors at some points, especially in his treatment of the fifth chapter of Romans. The work, however, is able and candid, and deserves to be pondered by all who are interested in the grave subject of which it treats,—the subject

“Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste,”

the author will not allow to have

“Brought death into the world and all our woe;”

though admitting that it was attended

“With loss of Eden”—

which he asserts, however, to have been, on the whole, an advantage.

REV. JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE ON THE TRUTHS AND ERRORS OF ORTHODOXY.*—This work, by a well known Unitarian minister of Boston, and bearing the imprint of the American Unitarian Association, has merits which deserve to be recognized. The author is a scholar, evidently devoted to theological and religious studies, and deeply interested in the momentous problems which these studies present. He expressly disclaims the old fashion of running a tilt against the orthodox system. He candidly avows that there must be a source of vitality in that system, which the Unitarian should seek to discover. A system that, after so long continued, energetic assaults, still survives in the affections of a multitude, must contain truth. To point out this measure of truth, is a part of his aim. His purpose is not polemical, but irenic. If the discovery is at length made that there is *some* truth in the orthodox system, is it rash to predict that our Unitarian friends, as a next step in their progress, will find out that there is *more* truth in it than this book admits? This further step would surely be not more remarkable than the one just taken in the work before

* *Orthodoxy; its Truths and Errors.* By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. Boston: American Unitarian Association. Walker, Fuller & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 512. New Haven: Judd & White. Price, \$1.75.

us. There are some features in the religious philosophy of this work which we are glad to see. The Unitarian Journals of late have been partially taken into the hands of a set of Comte-ites or Mill-ites, who advocate, with a great exhibition of self-conceit, a philosophy materialistic in its tendencies and wholly antagonistic to the spirit of the former leaders in the Unitarian movement. Mr. Clarke's philosophy is, in the best sense, spiritual. He believes in the claims of faith and in a higher nature in man by which he is qualified to cognize things above sense. He recognizes, also, the historical reality of the miracles recorded in the New Testament, including the miracle of the Resurrection of Jesus. In his chapters are found striking and quickening thoughts on the various topics of Christian doctrine. Although we cannot say that he has solved the problems connected with Inspiration, yet he has brought forward suggestions which bear the stamp of originality, and will interest thoughtful and independent minds. A like remark might be made in regard to several other chapters. In some of the discussions, the author is not consistent with himself, since the statement of a position is apparently followed by the retraction of it. Notwithstanding the careful division into sections, we are frequently presented with a cluster of thoughts rather than a methodical treatment. We notice that he has fallen into some errors of fact. He says, (page 230): "There are five sects in this country, all holding to the Assembly's Catechism—a large and minute compendium of opinions—and yet which often do not allow each other to commune at the Lord's table. The New School Presbyterians might permit the others to commune with *them*, but are themselves excluded. The Old School Presbyterians would commune with all but the New, but are not permitted." Inter-communion between these two bodies is not suspended. They celebrated the Lord's Supper in common at St. Louis not a year ago, on the occasion of the meeting of the two Assemblies in that city. Dr. Clarke has here fallen into a singular error. In speaking of the Atonement, Dr. Clarke concedes (page 63) that "it seems as if God *ought* not to forgive us our sins on so simple a condition [as repentance]. And it is on this very feeling that the whole Orthodox theory of the Atonement rests." Dr. Channing, in his famous Baltimore sermon, admitted that the death of Christ is in some way requisite to render repentance effectual for salvation. This is the main point of the Orthodox position. On the person of Christ and His relations to the

Father, Dr. Clarke is decidedly Unitarian. He tries to make out a great diversity of opinions concerning the Trinity, among the Orthodox themselves in the early ages of the Church. His observations on this topic are not well founded. If he had taken the general doctrine of Incarnation, he would have been obliged to admit a universal agreement. If he had taken the question whether the Son of God is a creature or not, he would have found the same unanimity; for Arianism was rejected as soon as it was seen to involve the ranking of the Divine Son among things *made*. The Papers included in the Appendix of this volume are in a more polemical tone. Dr. Clarke undertakes to combat the arguments which have been adduced by Dr. Joseph P. Thompson and others in favor of the doctrine of eternal punishment. We do not perceive that he brings forward, under this head, any considerations which have not been frequently examined, and, in our judgment, answered. Dr. Clarke discloses here the weak point in Unitarianism, as a practical system. It does not teach the *indispensable* necessity of religion—of repentance, faith, and a godly life. It tells the sinful man that religion is a good thing, an excellent thing, the best of possessions; but when he silently asks, ‘what if I continue as I am to the end of life; what if I decline to comply with your exhortation to repent; shall I be *LOST*—lost so that I shall *NEVER* reach Heaven?’ the Unitarian preacher must reply, ‘No; you cannot be thus lost; you may be somewhat delayed in your salvation, but you will come at length to the same place where I hope to be, and where there is perfect, eternal blessedness.’ The sinful man responds in his heart, ‘What is the brief period of my separation from you, compared with the eternity that lies beyond?’ Apart from the obstacles to the reception of Universalist doctrine which lie in the plain teachings of Christ and the Apostles, there stands the great difficulty that such doctrine robs the Gospel of its power. It is the tremendous issues connected with life and with the hearing of the Gospel, which alone command the attention of the world, and awe the hearts of men, moving them to listen to the call of Christ, and to obey it. When men are urged to the performance of duties which for any reason they are reluctant to perform, it is the instinct of human nature to inquire what will be the consequences of a refusal. Dr. Clarke sets himself to the task of showing that the consequences are infinitely less serious than the Church has generally

thought. The consequences, he affirms, are not everlasting ; they are only temporary.

We regret to find in so cultured and catholic a person as Dr. Clarke the old hatred of John Calvin. This feeling has led to an inadvertent misrepresentation of Calvin's opinions. Says Dr. Clarke :—"This has been in all ages the substance of Calvinism—Jewish Calvinism, Mohammedan Calvinism, Christian Calvinism. It declares that we are bound to submit to God, not because he is good, but because he is powerful." (p. 170.) "Calvinism, especially, makes of the Deity infinite power and infinite will. But no blasphemy is worse than that which, though with the best intentions, virtually destroys the moral character of the Almighty, reducing Him to an infinite will ; that is, making of Him an infinite tyrant." Now hear John Calvin himself, in reply to these hard imputations. "Quoniam mihi Dei voluntas summa est causa, ubique tamen doceo, ubi in ejus consiliis et operibus causa non apparet, apud eum tamen esse absconditum, *et nihil nisi juste et sapienter decreverit.*" (Amst. Ed. Tom. viii., 633.) "Itaque quod de absoluta potestate nugantur scholastici, non solum repudio, sed etiam detestor, quia justitiam ejus ab imperio separant." "Clare affirmo nihil eum decernere sine optima causa : quae si hodie nobis incognita est, ultimo die patefiet." Here we find Calvin detesting and repudiating the doctrine which is attributed to him by Dr. Clarke ! And yet Dr. Clarke would not willfully do injustice to Calvin. It is simply ignorance, the fruit of traditional prejudice. Dr. Clarke after quoting the Assembly's Catechism on the subject of "calling, election, and reprobation," says :—"So far as it is believed by those who profess it, it conveys the idea of a God who is pure will—a God, in short, who does as he pleases, saving some of his creatures, and damning others, without reason or justice." (p. 267.) Yet the very first sentence which Dr. Clarke quotes from the Catechism might have delivered him from this misinterpretation : "God, from all eternity, did, *by the most wise and HOLY counsel* of his own will, freely and unchangeably ordain whatever cometh to pass, yet so that neither is God the author of sin, *nor is violence offered to the will of the creatures, nor is the liberty or contingency of second causes taken away*, but rather established." The Catechism is sublapsarian in its doctrine. Calvin himself, notwithstanding some expressions which are adapted to give a contrary impression, was of the same mind. We do not think that Dr. Clarke means to be unfair ; but he looks at

the Calvinistic system from the outside, and from so great a distance, that he lamentably fails to appreciate it.

STANLEY'S HISTORY OF THE JEWISH CHURCH, VOLUME II.*—The "Chosen People" have not yet found a historian competent in all respects to record their wonderful career. The books of the Old Testament are the documents from which the historian must draw his materials. But what accuracy of philological study, what penetration of critical judgment, and, above all, what moral and spiritual qualities, are required in one who attempts to cast these diverse materials into a luminous and consecutive history! Ewald has the needful attainments in the province of philology and archaeology; but it is to be feared that the habit of confounding ingenious conjecture with well attested fact essentially impairs the value of his otherwise meritorious labors. Milman and writers of his stamp broach important questions, which they hardly seek to determine, or, at least, fail to discuss profoundly. Where is the Christian scholar who will do for Hebrew history a work analogous to that which Grote has done for the Greeks? Where is the scholar, endued with adequate learning and with talents meet for the undertaking, disregarding alike the dogmas of Rationalism and the traditional prejudices of an uninquiring orthodoxy, who will take up the literature of the Old Testament and describe the marvelous fortunes and character of the nation among whom it had its origin?

Dean Stanley is not the man for this work. It is no more than justice to say that he sets forth no ambitious claims, and does all that he proposes to do. Following the lead of Ewald and other scholars, he reproduces in a vivid narrative, intermingled with apposite moral reflections, the events and characters of the Old Testament History. David and Solomon, Saul and Jonathan, the heroes and prophets of the ancient time, pass before us on the pages of these lucid, picturesque, and often eloquent lectures. The inquisitive student is often balked at finding grave and difficult problems left without a solution, and at being served with edifying remarks in the room of scientific discussions. But he should bear in mind that the gifted and genial author is performing all

* *Lectures on the History of the Jewish Church.* Part II. From Samuel to the Captivity. By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY. 8vo. pp. xxx., 656. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. New Haven: Judd & White. Price, \$5.00.

that he has promised to do, and that he has furnished a work not only entertaining, but also, in its way, useful. Without settling the relation of the natural to the supernatural, and while often evading the perplexities which this cardinal question appears to create in his mind, he yet discourses on his theme in a style fitted to clothe the Old Testament annals with fresh life and interest.

PUNCHARD'S HISTORY OF CONGREGATIONALISM.*—We notice this work chiefly to call attention to some errors in the first volume which have fallen under our notice. In the account of the history of the Waldenses, the author has not had access to the latest investigations, and has consequently reiterated the old mistakes respecting the origin of this sect. Had he sufficiently weighed the remarks of Gieseler, to whom he does refer, he would have escaped these errors. The two principal scholars whose labors have served to settle disputed points in regard to the Waldenses, are Dieckhoff (*Die Waldenser im Mittelalter. Zwei Historische Untersuchungen. Göttingen, 1851*), and Herzog (*Die romanischen Waldenser. Halle, 1853*). The last writer has again treated of the same subject, referring, also, to newly discovered manuscripts of much value, in the *Real-Encyclopadie d. Prot. Theol. u. Kirche*, (Art. *Waldenser*), of which he is the editor. A discussion of the Waldensian History, by President Woolsey, previous, however, to the appearance of the works of Dieckhoff, and of Herzog, may be found in the *New Englander* for 1852 (Vol. X., pp. 277-300).

Had Mr. Punchard attended to the article of President Woolsey, and to the remarks of Gieseler, he would not have attempted to make out for the Waldenses a greater antiquity than the evidence warrants. There is no reason to think that this interesting sect is older than Peter Waldo, who founded it about A. D. 1170. The pretence of a higher antiquity is sustained by no valid proof, and is refuted by the best contemporary evidence. How this pretence probably arose, Gieseler well explains. (See Prof. Smith's Gieseler, Vol. II., p. 549. Note.)

Mr. Punchard is not acquainted with the fact that much of the

* *History of Congregationalism from about A. D. 250, to the Present Time.* In continuation of the account of the origin and earliest history of the system of Church Polity contained in "A View of Congregationalism." By GEORGE PUNCHARD. Second Edition: rewritten and greatly enlarged. New York: Hurd & Houghton. New Haven: T. H. Pease. Price, \$5.

Waldensian literature is of a much more modern date than was formerly supposed, and that really old documents have suffered much interpolation within the last few centuries. One of the most important of the Waldensian writings is the Noble Lesson ("Nobla Leyczon"). In that old poem occur the lines,

"A thousand and hundred years are fully accomplished
Since it was written thus, 'it is the last time.'"

This poem "was written," says Mr. Punchard, "as early as the twelfth century." But if the Scriptural quotation is from the Apocalypse, a book ascribed to the age of Domitian, there is no ground for dating the work earlier than the beginning of the thirteenth century. It was certainly written after the appearance of Waldo. But it is now rendered highly probable that the "Noble Lesson" is of much later origin. The manuscripts which Morland, Cromwell's messenger, brought from Piedmont in 1658, were discovered in 1862 by Mr. Bradshaw, Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. We quote from Herzog (in the *Real-Encyc.*) "Now the matter is decided. In volume B of those manuscripts, stands the *Nobla Leyczon*, and in it, to be sure, the line

"Ben ha mil e cent an compli entierament."
(A thousand and hundred years are fully accomplished),

But before the word *cent* (hundred), something has been erased, and, on closer examination, there is discovered the Arabic figure 4, of the same form in which it frequently occurs in the book. We can have no doubt on the point, since in volume C of the same collection, in a fragment from the same poem, we read,

"Ben ha mil e CCCC anz compli entierament."

Thus the poem in question falls into the fifteenth century,—a very important conclusion, since, if the NOBLA LEYCZON was written so late, there is no ground for assigning other poems and writings to an earlier period." Herzog shows that the writings of the Waldenses underwent great changes and interpolations, after they came into contact and intercourse with the Hussites, as well as after the Reformation, through the influence of the Reformers. Of the "Confession of Faith of the Waldenses and Albigenses," which Mr. Punchard dates (p. 179) at 1120, Herzog says:—"the above named corruptions of the literature of the Waldenses first found admission into the work of Perrin, 1619. He gives as an old *Confession de foy des Vaudois*, the confession which Morel laid be-

fore Œcolampadius and Bucer; some of the replies of Œcolampadius and Bucer being interpolated,—as the list of the canonical books of Scripture and the passage, before referred to, concerning the two sacraments. In the text of the catechism, he has the same doctrine of the two sacraments. While, in the older copy, the answer to the question about the number of the sacraments, ran:—‘Dui son necessaris e commun a tuit, li autre non son de tanta necessita,’—we read in Perrin:—‘Dui, ezo es lo batisme e la eucharistia.’ Like falsifications he has made in other writings. From the tract concerning the sacraments he leaves out the citations from Wicliff and Jacob de Misa, in order not to betray the later date of the tract. In the exposition of the ten commandments, he follows the order in the Reformed Church, although the older manuscript follows the Catholic order.”

In treating of the Paulicians and kindred sects, Mr. Punchard has undertaken to show that they were not infected with Manichean, dualistic opinions. In this position he is entirely incorrect. It is fully ascertained that such opinions widely prevailed among them. The evidence, which may be found in the best ecclesiastical historians of the present day, is conclusive on this point; and we are surprised to find Mr. Punchard asserting the contrary.

In describing the Novatians and Donatists, Mr. Punchard assumes, on insufficient grounds, that they have been greatly misrepresented by their opponents. He enters into a *quasi* vindication of these sects. Now, on the great point of church discipline, which constitute their peculiarity, viz.—the doctrine that the *lapsi* (those who had proved unfaithful under the pressure of persecution) should *never* be received back to communion, they were unquestionably wrong, and the body of the church was unquestionably right. The Donatists aimed at an ideal, ascetic purity in the visible church; and in this they were wrong, however their opponents may have erred.

It is the fault of Mr. Punchard's work that he is too desirous of tracing the line of true piety through these various sects, and of ignoring the excellence that was found in the Catholic body, even after the outgrowth of its corruptions. With him, the Pope is only “the man of sin;” the Catholic Church is only “the harlot,” “the mother of abominations;” and, hence, he is led to present a rose-colored view of the dissenting and antagonistic parties. Let these parties have their due. In some cases, great credit belongs

to them—for example, to the Waldenses—for their protest against certain errors and evils prevalent in their time. But we are under no necessity of considering these sects to be alone the representatives of real Christianity in the world. We make a serious mistake in doing so. The natural tendency of such a mistake is to magnify their excellencies, to leave their errors and faults unnoticed, and, also, to attribute to some of them an age to which they have no claim. Throughout the first volume of Mr. Punchard's work, his statements require to be sifted and rectified in the light of a severer historical criticism than he has made use of.

GUIZOT'S REFLECTIONS UPON THE PRESENT STATE OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.*—This is the second volume in the series which M. Guizot is now publishing. Guizot is an old man. He was born in 1787, and has lately seen his seventy-ninth birthday. His father perished on the scaffold during the French Revolution. The son was chiefly educated in Geneva, whither he had fled with his mother. Since the year 1806, when he returned to Paris, he has pursued a literary and political career which has been marked by great industry and activity, and has made his name illustrious. The number and variety of his publications is astonishing. Some of his early works related to the French language and literature; but his most valuable writings pertain to the department of history. In this department he is an acknowledged master. Since the downfall of Louis Philippe's Government, in which he was a minister, he has been engaged upon several works of importance. He has published, in seven volumes, *Memoirs of his own Times* (*Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire de mon temps*); his parliamentary speeches, together with a historical commentary, in five volumes, under the title of *Histoire Parlementaire de France*; a volume, which appeared in 1861, upon the Church and Christian Society (*L'Eglise et la Société Chrétienne en 1861*); and various minor writings, independently of the series of which the present volume forms the second part. The first volume in this series related to the Fundamental Doctrines of the Christian Religion (*Méditations sur l'essence de la Religion Chrétienne*). In the doctrines of Original Sin, of the Incarnation, and of the Atonement, the author found the satisfactory solution of the great problems which have always engaged the attention of mankind, and

* *Méditations sur l'état actuel de la Religion Chrétienne.* Par M. Guizot. Paris: Michel Levy Frères. 1866.

the explanation of facts not otherwise intelligible. The volume before us deals with the actual condition of Christianity, involving a notice of the various movements in philosophy which characterize our times. The first chapter, comprising more than half of the work (pp. 1-201), is a description of the Revival of Religion in France, both on the Roman Catholic and the Protestant side, since the French Revolution, or during the present century. It is a very fine review of that reaction against infidel opinions and religious insensibility, which is a far grander movement on the continent of Europe than most persons are aware. Guizot, as one might expect, is prompt to discern and acknowledge the evidences of renewed piety in the Catholic, not less than in the Protestant, communion. His remarks upon individuals, most of whom he has known personally, such as de Maistre, Chateaubriand, the Abby de la Mennais, Montalembert, Bautain, Maret, Lacordaire, Vinet, Adolphe Monod, form an interesting feature of this review. Under the head of Spiritualism, Guizot examines that philosophical school, of which M. Royer-Collard was the prime mover, and of which Jouffroy and Cousin have been distinguished members. The remaining topics are Rationalism; Positivism; Pantheism; Materialism; Scepticism; Impiety, Indifference, and Perplexity. Nothing can exceed the good sense and good temper which are brought to the discussion of these themes. M. Guizot lays hold of the characteristic peculiarities of the systems which he undertakes to criticise, without entering into nice and subtle discriminations. He claims for the indestructible instincts and sentiments of human nature that authority which the different forms of scepticism tacitly deny them. The boasted generalizations of Comte respecting the religious progress of mankind are shown to be destitute of a historical foundation. The entire book is in the candid and liberal tone of a philosopher, while the genuine Christian feeling that pervades the volume renders it not less edifying than instructive.

SHORT SERMONS TO NEWSBOYS.*—Our readers do not need to be informed with regard to the early history of the Lodging House for Newsboys in New York; but they will be gratified to

* *Short Sermons to Newsboys*; with a History of the Foundation of the Newsboys' Lodging House. By CHARLES LORING BRACE. New York: Chas. Scribner & Co 1866. 12mo. pp. 244.

know that this enterprise is meeting with greater success every year. During the last twelve months, over seven thousand different boys—a majority being of the age of thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen—found lodging there, and availed themselves of the privileges it affords. It is to these street boys that the sermons contained in this book have been preached by Mr. Brace. There are many things about these sermons that we might commend; but it is perhaps the highest praise to say that they present the central doctrines of religion respecting Christ, and a life of faith in Him, with such clearness, simplicity, and tact, that they succeeded in gaining the attention of a room full of the wildest boys in New York. We commend this volume to all that large class of persons who are interested in the solution of the question, how can the masses be brought to receive Christ.

THE BOOK OF WORSHIP.*—The attention which has been given of late years to the subject of public worship, has prompted many efforts to improve the service of song, and especially to do this by the encouragement of congregational singing in distinction from the service rendered by a select choir. If some of these efforts have been less successful than devout and earnest men had hoped—if congregations have been slow to insist on the privilege of lifting up their voice to God in song—if choirs and choir leaders have been jealous of any invasion of their domain—this was to have been expected, and need not discourage renewed attempts to correct the public taste, and make our singing more devotional.

A new candidate for popular approval appears in the form of a hymn and tune book, under the title of "*The Book of Worship, Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, with music,*" compiled by Rev. Leonard W. Bacon, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

We have come to regard a hymn and tune book as a necessity in common worship. The highest attainment in devotional song dispenses, indeed, with the printed page; the words flow along without an effort of the memory to recall them, and the mind takes no more note of the pitch and succession of sounds, than of the variations and tones of the voice in speech. But though the best hymns should be as familiar to Christians as household

* *The Book of Worship, Psalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, with Music.* New York: William B. Bradbury. pp. 528. 12mo. 612 hymns, 339 tunes, 6 indexes.

words, it would be unwise to restrict public devotion to such songs as are universally known, and the hymn book must therefore, if for no other reason, be resorted to continually. The notes also are of no less service in keeping in use a variety of tunes sufficient to avoid monotony; in keeping alive the association of hymns and tunes and in securing a more correct rendering of the music than if it was caught by ear and sung from memory alone. We are satisfied that for the present, at least, a liberal supply of tune books in the church, the prayer meeting, and the sabbath school, is indispensable, if the voices of the multitude are to be combined in song.

Mr. Bacon's book has many points of excellence and some peculiarities which will commend it to the public favor. Without being nearly as thick as some of the hymn books in common use, it is printed in coarse and legible type, with an ample margin on each page. Economy of space is secured by condensing the *music* more than usual, and by printing some of the hymns in peculiar meter in a new way. The advantage thus gained reconciles us to the novelty of having "Upward I lift mine eyes," and "My faith looks up to thee," printed in stanzas of four lines. In the selection and arrangement of the tunes, the editor has consulted the convenience of the worshiper. Having classified and arranged his hymns, he has printed his tunes where they are wanted, repeating them in different parts of the volume as often as need be, and always repeating the tune on the following page when a hymn extends to the reverse of a leaf.

On examining the contents of this hymnal, we are satisfied that it contains the great body of devotional lyrics, old and new, which are and ought to be commonest in use in public worship in our churches. It is a judicious selection of the best and most useful hymns; and its six hundred and twelve pieces are more than any one church positively needs or will be likely to use. The excellence of the book as a manual for common use is largely due to its omissions. We are glad to see included in it such hymns as

"Lord! at this closing hour,"

"The God of peace, who from the dead," and

"Hail! tranquil hour of closing day,"

all of which, we believe, first appeared in the "Connecticut" book of Psalms and Hymns.

Such hymns at these, also, could not be spared :

"My days are gliding swiftly by."
 "Nearer, my God, to thee."
 "Just as I am without one plea."
 "I've found the pearl of greatest price."
 "Purer yet and purer."
 "O bread to pilgrims given."

And among others highly to be prized, we are glad to find

"From foes that would the land devour."
 "There is no name so sweet on earth."
 "My hope is built on nothing less
 Than Jesus' blood and righteousness."
 "Come, O Creator, Spirit blest."
 "O come, O come, Immanuel."

And the following from "Happy Voices":

"He is risen, he is not here."
 "Saviour, listen to our prayer."
 "Roll, Jordan, roll."
 "Jerusalem forever bright."

There are, however, a few hymns which we should willingly spare; especially the 547th, beginning,

*"Nothing either great or small
 Remains for me to do;
 Jesus died, and paid it all,
 Yes, all the debt I owe."*

In this case, the Antinomianism of the hymn is made more pernicious by the fascinating melody to which it is united.

The 557th, "Sweet hour of prayer!" is another hymn wedded to a sweet air, and having much that is beautiful in its sentiment, and yet extravagant in its description of the close of life.

*"Sweet hour of prayer! sweet hour of prayer!
 May I thy consolation share:
 Till from Mount Pisgah's lofty height,
 I view my home, and take my flight.
 This robe of flesh I'll drop, and rise
 To seize the everlasting prize;
 And shout, while passing through the air,
 Farewell, farewell, sweet hour of prayer."*

Did ever saint die thus?

The arrangement of hymns in such a collection is a matter of convenience to ministers conducting public worship, but only of secondary importance; for the work is not designed to be read through or sung through consecutively, but by selections. Yet

there are advantages in putting together those of the same general character. Mr. Bacon arranges his selection from the Psalms in a division by themselves, following the order of the original. The remainder of the lyrics he divides into "hymns" and "spiritual songs," including under the latter appellation such as differ from ordinary hymns, "in *form*, being constructed with a chorus or refrain recurring at the end of each stanza; or in *substance*, being made up of narrative or allegory—ballads or carols rather than hymns; or in *style*, being, either in words or music, more secular in character or association than the taste and judgment of many congregations would approve, for ordinary public use; or in *purpose*, being distinctly intended for the smaller and more informal meetings for social worship, or especially for the use of children in Sunday Schools."

Under this general division, his arrangement depends upon the feeling expressed in the hymn, so that after the "hymns of worship," we have "hymns of Christian experience," "of godly sorrow," "of repentance," "of faith," "of assurance," &c., &c.

As a tune book, we hope the work may be a success. Besides some new and beautiful tunes, the old familiar ones are given in sufficient variety, and in their customary form. They are the tunes that must be relied on in the main where many voices are to be united in sacred song. But if we do not mistake the signs of the times, the lips of the multitude are to be opened in public worship by the use of choruses or refrains, which are coming into use through the Sabbath Schools. We have hardly known in our churches what it is to have a congregational response in chorus after a song; but many delegates to the National Council will long remember hearing Dr. George Adams sing, at Plymouth, Mrs. Howe's Battle Hymn of the Republic, and at the close of each stanza, taking up with him the soul-stirring refrain,

"Glory! glory! hallelujah!"

More than half of the one hundred hymns classed as "Spiritual Songs," are arranged with these refrains. Some of them, like "Awake, my soul! in joyful lays," have been in use far more than a generation. Many others, like "My days are gliding swiftly by," have become familiar to every one through Sunday Schools. Some of them, like "Come to Jesus, just now," we have found to be of great service when sung *impromptu* in conference meetings. And we think some of them will be found invaluable, if judiciously

employed, in large assemblies for public worship. Mr. Bradbury's choicest melodies are introduced, and some of Mr. Bacon's tunes are very unique and spirited, as those for the hymns, "The Word is made incarnate," "O come, O come, Immanuel," and "Jesus of Nazareth passeth by."

We only add that we know of no work better adapted for all the ordinary purposes of sacred song, than this new "Book of Worship."

A COMMENTARY ON THE MINOR PROPHETS.*—We have before us a portion of this work,—the part containing Hosea, Joel, and Amos. It is practical rather than critical in its aim, but cannot, for that reason, plead exemption from trial by critical rules. The interpretation must first of all be sound, before it can be, in any right sense, edifying. Too commonly this rule is reversed, and the edifying character of the interpretation made the test of its soundness.

It seems an obvious requirement that one who undertakes the office of commentator should first make himself acquainted with what others have done in his department, at least, with the latest and best of the commentaries. Not only is there no evidence that this has been done in the present case, but even of those at his command he appears not to have made the best use. Rosenmüller, whom he quotes, if properly used, would have kept him from many of the absurdities of interpretation and some offenses against the principles of Hebrew grammar of which he is guilty. A detailed examination of these our space would not allow, even did the book deserve it; we content ourselves with one or two examples.

The symbolical language in the first three chapters of Hosea, where the prophet represents himself as commanded to take a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms, setting forth under this figure the infidelity of Israel to Jehovah, our author interprets literally; i. e., he regards it as an actual transaction by which the prophet brought forcibly before the minds of the people the unnatural and sinful character of their relation to God. The only alternative presented is a *vision* of the transaction, and we are referred in further defense of the author's view to a dissertation in the Appendix to the volume, where the subject of symbolical transactions in general is discussed more fully. If any need to have the un-

* Commentary on the Minor Prophets. By HENRY COWLES.

tenableness of this view proved to them, the following example of a similar use of language by Jeremiah will perhaps suffice. In Jeremiah, ch. xiii., the prophet is commanded to get a linen girdle, to bind it on his loins, and to make a journey to the Euphrates, and hide it in a hole of the rock. After many days he returns to find the girdle rotten and worthless, thereby expressing under the image of the girdle Israel's former intimate union with Jehovah and its present corruption. Now, if we suppose all this to have happened as described, we have an expenditure of force out of all proportion to the result gained. The action in this case would be trivial, as in the other, offensive to all ideas of morality; while in both the length of time required (in Hosea several years) to convey the lesson would altogether destroy the impression of it. But regarded simply as a symbolical form in which the idea is presented, the language becomes forcible and appropriate.

It must not, however, from the above example, be inferred that our author is the champion of literal interpretation. He is quite willing to abandon it on occasion. In Hos. i. 10, 11, he understands by *Israel* the true people of God, Gentiles as well Jews, while ch. iii. he refers to the literal Israel. In connection with this last passage he enunciates (p. 18) his theory of prophetic interpretation.

"In general the construction given to chapter i., 10, 11, is justified on its own proper grounds, to be determined in view of what it is, and of its relations to history and to the doctrine of the New Testament. So of the construction given above to chapter iii. It must be interpreted in view of what it is. Such I hold to be the true theory of interpreting all prophecy."

The vital point of the theory, the question "What is prophecy?" is here altogether passed over, and the total misconception on this point which reigns in the book is its fatal defect. In the view of our author, and he is here simply the representative of the popular opinion, the prophet spoke and wrote not so much for his own as for later times, especially to furnish us with a proof of the supernatural character of revelation; and, consequently, he is neither entitled, nor by his interpreters suffered, to say anything which does not in every particular coincide with the later developments of history and revelation,—an incidental element of prophecy being thus made its principal end. This is what our author means when he says that prophecy is to be interpreted in view of "its relations to history and the doctrines of the New Testament." By alternate stretching and twisting, the predic-

tions of the prophet are made to cover all the details of later history, and his teaching becomes identical with that of Christ and his Apostles. What we have gained when this is accomplished, we confess ourselves unable to understand. This interpretation enables us at best to find in the Old Testament what we already knew, while the proper uses of the prophetic writings are altogether lost in the attempt to make out of them imperfect history. Something more is needed to convert the New Testament Greek into good Hebrew, or its history into prophecy, than simply to read it backward. If we could in any way faithfully reproduce the history of the prophet's own time, this would be a vastly greater help to the understanding of his writings, a better key for the unlocking of his prophecies, than any knowledge of the later history. Very much may be gathered by careful study from the prophetic writings themselves to supply the deficiencies of the historical books, as the wonderful manner in which Ewald, in his reconstruction of the Jewish history, has combined scattered hints, abundantly shows. But the school of interpreters to which our author belongs is far more anxious to read in these writings the history of the future than of the present. So too in the Messianic and other teachings of the prophets, the differences of one from the other, and of all from the New Testament writers, are effaced, and, instead of a portraiture of the Messiah changing from age to age, we are presented with one unvarying image, and that drawn from the New Testament. What then was the meaning of our Saviour's declaration, that the least in the Kingdom of Heaven was greater than the greatest of the prophets? But to our author Biblical Theology is an unknown, and, on his principles of interpretation, an impossible science.

The most elaborate of the expositions in the pages before us, and one which is at the same time a good illustration of his method, is that on Joel ii. 23. Here six pages are devoted to an attempt to prove that the words rendered in our version, "he hath given you the former rain moderately," or more correctly, "he will give you the former rain in due measure," should be translated, "he will give you a teacher of righteousness." The question is in his own words: "*Whether the passage is a promise of rain only, or whether it comprises a far richer promise and prophecy of spiritual blessings?*" With such a choice before him, we are only surprised that he should think six pages of argument necessary. He urges that the use of *moreh* in the sense of *rain* is very

infrequent, while it often occurs in that of *teacher*. But aside from Psalm lxxxiv. 7, where the former sense is found, (Dr. Alexander to the contrary notwithstanding), its undisputed occurrence in the second member of the verse in question, taken in connection with the requirement of the poetic parallelism, is perfectly decisive. And yet this repetition is strangely enough urged against the received rendering. He further quotes Taylor's Concordance, which gives forty-three instances of the Hiphil of the verb in the sense *to teach*, but not one in the sense *to rain*. But if he had not mistranslated Hos. vi. 3, where *joreh* (quoted by Gesenius through mistake under Kal instead of Hiphil) is a verb and not a noun, he would have found such an instance, though this is of no consequence to the argument, since the noun *moreh* is formed not from the Hiphil but from the Kal. But we must be excused from following him further. Let it not be supposed, however, from our unfavorable criticism, that the commentary is worse than many that have preceded it; it is a sufficient condemnation that it is also no better. The first sense of the prophet's words, together with the connection of thought, is in general correctly given; and if the work could be used with reference to this only, it would doubtless be to many persons a help. Our remarks apply not more to this particular work than to the school of interpretation of which it is an example.

HISTORICAL.

BANCROFT'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, VOL. IX.*—The new volume of Mr. Bancroft's work covers the eventful period from the Declaration of Independence and the occupation of New York by the American forces, to the spring of 1778. Among the military events which fall into this interval, are the battle and subsequent evacuation of Long Island, the evacuation of the city of New York, the contest in the neighborhood of the Hudson, including the surrender of Fort Washington, the retreat of Washington through the Jerseys, with the brilliant actions at Trenton and Princeton, the defeat at Brandywine and the capture of Philadelphia by Howe, and the invasion and surrender of Burgoyne. The record of important civil events, as the establishment of the Con-

* *History of the United States from the Discovery of the American Continent.* By GEORGE BANCROFT. Vol. IX. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1866. pp. 506. New Haven: Judd & White. Price, \$3.

stitutions of the several States, and of the Confederation, the diplomatic efforts of Franklin and others abroad, the political fluctuations in England, and the formation of the American alliance with France, is interwoven at fitting points. All these events, civil and military, are described with an admirable perspicuity. The narrative is sufficiently full, and yet the author is frugal of words. In the disposition of the matter, he has shown extraordinary skill. Nothing is omitted, yet there is no confusion, and the story moves on with all the unity, and with more than the interest, of a drama. The sympathy of the author with his subject imparts life to his pages. But there is no lack of impartiality. Praise and blame are fearlessly distributed. The culpable ambition and inefficiency of Gates, the treachery of Lee, the occasional incompetency and conceit of so good an officer as Greene, and the failure of others, high in command, to meet their obligations, are clearly set forth. One important feature of this volume is the complete vindication which is afforded to the military abilities and conduct of Washington. His judgment generally proved itself correct, although it was frequently questioned and even despised by rash and conceited officers, and sometimes distrusted by civilians, like John and Samuel Adams. The majestic figure of Washington is all the more impressive, when seen amidst the heavy clouds of detraction which, during a portion of his career, hung over him. His calm wisdom, his modest and resolute will, his patriotism which no embarrassments or personal injuries could damp, received at length their reward in the general homage paid to him by his countrymen and by the world. Mr. Bancroft's discriminating narrative shows that the Fabian policy grew out of no hesitancy or sluggishness of feeling, but was the result of the soundest calculation, and was followed when other impulses of Washington's nature could have impelled him in a contrary direction. At Trenton and Princeton, as in many other places in the course of the war, he gave proof of his personal gallantry and of the dash of which he was capable at the proper emergency.

When we consider the number of men engaged, these battles of the Revolution, in the light of our recent experience, seem insignificant. But it is the moral elements—the issue that is pending—the spirit of the actors—that give character to a contest. Judged in this way, the battles of the Revolution are clothed with unrivaled interest and dignity. The battle of Marathon, on the event of which history turned, was fought by a few thousand

Athenians; and a like fact is true of most of the Grecian battles. The number of the combatants was small. Who, on this account, can read of those battles without deep emotion? In truth, the little engagement at Trenton is not less momentous, and from the moral point of view, is even grander, than Gettysburg.

It is now thirty-two years since Mr. Bancroft wrote the preface to his first volume. His researches, which began at a much earlier date, have been indefatigable. To whatever criticisms his work may be justly open, it must always remain a standard authority, on account of the thorough, well-nigh exhaustive, studies that lie at the foundation of it. In connection with the history of the Revolution, he has not only obtained invaluable documents from the archives of England and France; but from Germany, also, he has derived materials of great importance. The part taken by German mercenary troops in the war is well described in the volume before us; and the diaries and letters of some of them throw much light on the transactions in which they took part.

We have in our hands a collection of letters, addressed to his wife by General Silliman of Connecticut, father of the late Professor B. Silliman. They were written during the progress of the military events recorded in the first part of this volume. General Silliman commanded a brigade of Connecticut militia on Long Island and in the evacuation of New York. He also took an active part in the transactions immediately subsequent, being present in the action at White Plains; and afterwards, in conjunction with Arnold, he resisted and harassed the British expedition for the destruction of the military stores in Danbury, in 1777. His name occurs on page 121 and page 347 of Mr. Bancroft's volume. We subjoin two brief extracts from General Silliman's letters, having reference to the evacuation of New York. Under date of Sept 15th, 1776, 10 o'clock A. M., he describes the active movements of the British preparing to effect a landing; and on the same sheet, under date of Monday, the 16th, 9 o'clock A. M., from "the camp about four miles below King's Bridge," he writes:—

"The affair of yesterday was most unfortunate. The army are all here, and between King's Bridge and here, and at King's Bridge. I am well and hearty; but can't give you particulars. Now, only the enemy are in possession of New York and all between here and there. My brigade was left in New York the last of all, and the enemy landed between me and the rest of the army, and cut off all communication. My way was hedged up, but the Lord opened it. I brought in all my brigade except a few. It was sometime in the night before I got in.

It was expected by the army, as well as by myself, that I and my brigade must perish."

The following passage is from a letter written the next day :

"CAMP ON HARLAEM HEIGHTS, 17th September, 1776, }
2 o'clock, afternoon."

"On the morning of last Sabbath we had information that the regulars on Long Island were in motion, as though they would cross the East river and land about three miles above the city. At this place lay their ships close in with our shore, and soon after the regulars marched in a large body down to the shore, and embarked on board their flat-bottomed boats. Upon this, their ships began a most incessant fire on our lines opposite to them with their grape shot, from which they were distant about fifty rods, and behind which lay General Wedaworth's and Colonel Douglas's brigades—until the fire was so hot from the ships that they were obliged to retreat. On this, the regulars immediately landed and fired upon them, which completed their confusion, and they ran away up here, and are here now; but they were out, a part of them, in yesterday's action, and behaved nobly. Now, as to myself and my brigade. We were left to guard the city until all the rest of the troops were drawn off; and about half an hour or an hour after all the troops were gone, I was ordered with my brigade to march out of the city, and man the lines on the East River opposite to Bayard's Hill Fort. There I marched, and saw the regular army land above me, and spread across the Island from one river to the other, until my retreat seemed to be entirely cut off, and soon after received an order to retreat if I could. I attempted it up along through the woods on the North river, where I came in sight of the enemy several times, but kept my brigade covered in the woods, so that I got through them to their uppermost guard, and they pursued and fired on my rear, and took a few of my men. I immediately formed about three hundred of my men on a hill to oppose them. On seeing this, the regulars fled, and I pursued my retreat; and through the great mercy of God, I got my brigade safe here, where I am now posted. * * * 'Twas supposed by everybody that I and my brigade were entirely cut off, but, through the great mercy of God, it is otherwise, and let His Holy Name have all the praise! I hope we shall be able to prevent their progress into the country, for when we get them away from their ships we can deal with them."

The statements of this eye-witness confirm those of Mr. Bancroft, and only present some additional particulars.

MERIVALE ON THE CONVERSION OF THE NORTHERN NATIONS.*—Four of the eight lectures in this volume relate, not to the Northern nations, but to the ancient peoples. These four lectures form

* *The Conversion of the Northern Nations.* The Boyle Lectures for the year 1865. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B. D. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. pp. 231. New Haven: H. C. Peck. Price, \$2.00.

the continuation of the writer's previous volume on the conversion of the pagan nations, which we noticed in the issue of the *New Englander* for July, 1865. The remainder of the volume is devoted to the subject which is designated in the title. The characteristics of this little work appear to be similar to those of the earlier work just mentioned. There is a great disadvantage, as respects method, in treating such themes according to the plan prescribed in the Boyle or Bampton Lectures. In place of a connected treatise, we have a series of sermons. The learning must be crowded into the notes; and yet the sermons are sermons only in name. We notice the same elegance of style in these lectures that belongs to all of his historical writings.

D'AUBIGNE'S HISTORY OF THE REFORMATION IN THE TIME OF CALVIN. Vol. IV.*—Dr. Merle, in the first part of this volume, resumes his account of the Reformation in England at the point where he left off in the fifth volume of his former well-known work, "*The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century*." The period, the history of which he now traces, is the one just after the fall and death of Wolsey, between the autumn of 1529 and the spring of 1534;—the period during which the English Church resumed its independence of the papacy. Those who have read Mr. Froude's history of this period will not fail to notice the greater prominence that Dr. Merle gives to what he calls the "real Reformation" that was going on in the hearts of the English people. In fact, a marked feature of this work is the sharp distinction which is everywhere drawn between the political changes of the court and that religious movement which was in progress, which had nothing to do with the policy, the tyranny, the intrigues, and the divorce of Henry VIII. Dr. Merle sums all up in these words: "If in this matter there had been nothing more than the decision of a prince discontented with the court of Rome, a contrary decision of one of his successors might again place England under the dominion of the pontiffs; and these would be sure to spare no pains to recover the good graces of the English kings. But in despite of Henry VIII., a pure doctrine, similar to that of the apostolic times, was spreading over the different parts of the nation; a doctrine which was not only to wrest England from the Pope, but to establish in that

* *History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin*. Vol. IV. By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 491. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

island a true Christianity—a vast evangelical propaganda which should plant the standard of God's word even at the ends of the earth."

The last half of the volume is devoted to the progress of the Reformation in the city of Geneva, after its bishop-prince had fled, never to return. A fresh interest gathers around this part of the story, as we now daily watch, in our contemporary history, the declining fortunes of the temporal power of the last of the bishop-princes—the Pope in Rome.

MISCELLANEOUS.

STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS ON CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARTY QUESTIONS.*—We took up this book with considerable interest, expecting to find in it somewhat of the secret history of the political career of Mr. Douglas, and especially of the rise and progress, decline and fall of his "great principle of Popular Sovereignty." The history of Mr. Douglas, especially during the last ten years of his life, could we get its complete revelation, must be one of the profoundest interest and value to the present and future generations of Americans. During that period, political recklessness, corruption, and crime seem to have culminated. Thirty years of rule had permanently established the slave power as the despot of the nation—the dispenser of all its power and patronage. Statesmen and politicians, and seemingly all classes among the people, were bowing before the tyrant, while imbecility and treachery, fraud, violence and corruption were bearing down everywhere, in public and in private affairs, all opposition to its haughty behests. In the midst of this whirlpool of foul waters, was Senator Douglas, now directing their movements, and now tossed upon their current, and he more than any man then living could have revealed the causes, and forces, and movements of the tide which swept on its course to secession and bloody rebellion. Much of all this we expected to find; but to our surprise there is scarcely anything of which the book tells less. It is the book of Douglas, with all of Douglas left out. Some two hundred pages of commonplace talk upon topics connected with the history and polity of the United States, such as might have been given

* *A brief Treatise upon Constitutional and Party Questions, and the History of Political Parties, as I received it orally from the late Senator Stephen A. Douglas of Illinois.* By J. MADISON CURTIS, Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel, U. S. A. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

by a father to his son of twelve years old, is about all that the volume contains. There is indeed a chapter on the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, and one on Popular Sovereignty, but the former contains little more than would be found on that subject in any ordinary school history, and the other gives a mere explanation of the term without any discussion of the principle.

On the whole, we find ourselves quite at a loss to account for the publication of the book at all; yet we confess to a feeling of relief that if it disappoints us in furnishing nothing new to the political history of the country, it yet adds nothing to the load which already weighs so heavily on Mr. Douglas's name. The best service his friends can do to his memory is not to write books, or build monuments, or deliver orations to draw attention to his character and public career, but to leave him to such obscurity as may be possible to one so closely identified with public affairs, and to pray that he may in time be totally forgotten. We should be false to our duty should we even silently acquiesce in the glorifications of Mr. Douglas which have of late so widely appeared in our public prints. This post-mortem adulation is discreditable to us as a people, and is little calculated to inspire ambitious American youths with a conviction that in a public leader consistency to principle is essential to success, and virtue indispensable to an honorable memory. To call him a statesman, and especially a great statesman, is a ridiculous abuse of language, and an insult to the few great names in our history to whom such a designation may properly apply. His career up to the election of Mr. Lincoln was that of a coarse, unscrupulous demagogue, whose "statesmanship" resulted in the utter discomfiture of himself and all his schemes, and drew speedily down upon his country calamities, among the greatest that a single man ever entailed upon a nation. When secession finally occurred, and he was left deserted upon the north side of the line, when all his ambitious hopes had been dashed to the earth, at last, for the brief remainder of his life, he turned—let us hope and charitably admit with patriotic feeling—to resist his betrayers, and to defend his country against the rebellion for which he was so largely responsible. Let the last acts of his life be remembered with all due kindness and honor, but let them not blind us to the truth and justice of history with regard to his previous career. We protest, in the name of common sense, against such assumptions as the following, in reference

to the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, which we find in General Dix's oration in Chicago :

"Whatever difference of opinion may exist, or may heretofore have existed, with regard to these measures, no one of this day will call in question the patriotic motive by which Mr. Douglas was actuated—his deep anxiety to preserve the harmony of the Union, his sincerity, and the great intellectual power with which he maintained every position he took."

SHERBROOKE.*—This a story for those who are so fond of stories—young girls; and is written by a Christian author, for the purpose of stirring within them higher aspirations than are usually found in the careless, frolicking years of girlhood. The "perennial nobleness of work" is demonstrated within these pages; and few can read them without feeling the heart thrill with a fresh impulse toward virtue and an honest living. The young heroine lives a life not at all beyond the reach of any New England maiden of fair abilities. Her destiny is shaped by no thrilling adventure. The daily monotony is interrupted by no such occurrences as stop the breath and make the hair stand on end. She lives a simple, working, growing life; a life full enough of incident to absorb the attention from the first page to the last; and intermingled with characters that provoke the readers sometimes to indignation, sometimes to laughter, and sometimes to tears. No one will be likely to forget Aunt Lyma. And no step-mother can fail to find in the patient, hopeful, earnest spirit of Mrs. Kendall both a model and a virtue.

The authoress of Sherbrooke has long been an accepted writer—having contributed some of the most sparkling stories and some of the most graceful verses that have adorned our periodical literature for years. Her first book, "Madge," had an unusual popularity; and Sherbrooke will make her name still more extensively and favorably known. We hope her career of usefulness and success has just begun.

PROFESSOR WHITE'S PHI BETA KAPPA ADDRESS.†—This thoughtful, learned, and timely discussion is mainly taken up with

* *Sherbrooke*. By H. R. G., author of *Madge*. New York: Appleton & Co.

† *The most Bitter Foe of Nations, and the Way to its Permanent Overthrow*. An Address delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, at Yale College, July 25, 1866. By ANDREW D. WHITE. New Haven: Thomas H. Pease. 1866. pp. 86.

historical proofs and illustrations of the proposition that the most vigorous and most noxious enemy of a nation's welfare is an aristocracy which is based upon habits or traditions of oppression. The orator draws his arguments from modern European history, and fortifies them by full references to the best authorities. In particular, he surveys the history of Spain, Italy, Poland, France, and England, with briefer notices of Germany and Russia; and he finds in the past career of each of these nations full support for his thesis. The lesson for America is all the more impressive for not being expressly inculcated. It is latent through all the Address. The following passage occurs near the conclusion:—

Herein is written the greatness or littleness of nations—herein is written the failure or success of their great struggles. In all history, those be the great nations which have boldly grappled with political dragons, and not only put them down but *kept* them down.

The work of saving a nation from an oligarchy then is two fold. It is not finished until both parts are completed. Nations forget this at their peril. Nearly every great modern revolution wherein has been gain to liberty has had to be fought over a second time. So it was with the English Revolution of 1642. So it was with the French Revolutions of 1789 and 1830. What has been gained by bravery has been lost by treachery. Nations have forgotten that vigorous fighting to gain liberty must be followed by sound planning to secure it.

What is this sound planning? Is it superiority in duplicity? Not at all; it is the only planning which insists on frank dealing. Is it based on cupidity? Not at all; it is based on Right. Is it centered in Revenge? Not at all; its centre is Mercy and its circumference is Justice. It may say to the discomfited oppressor, you shall have Mercy; but it must say to the enfranchised, you shall have Justice.

Acknowledging this, Suger and the great mediæval statesmen succeeded; ignoring this, Louis XI., Richelieu, and a host of great modern statesmen failed.

To keep the haughty and turbulent caste of oppressors in their proper relations, the central authority in every nation has been obliged to form a close alliance with the down-trodden caste of workers. If these have been ignorant, it has had to instruct them; if they have been wretched, it has had to raise them; and the simple way—nay, the only way to instruct and raise them has been to give them rights, civil and political, which will force them to raise and instruct themselves.

But it may be said that some subject classes are *too low* thus to be lifted—that there are some races too weak to be thus wrought into a barrier against aristocracy. I deny it. For history denies it. The race is not yet discovered in which the average man is not better and safer with rights than without them.

Think you that *your* ancestors were so much better than *other* subject classes? Look in any town directory. The names show an overwhelming majority of us descendants of European serfs and peasantry. I defy you to find any body of men more degraded and stupid than our ancestors.

Do you boast Anglo-Saxon ancestry?—look at Charles Kingsley's picture in Hereward of the great banquet, the apotheosis of wolfishness and piggishness; or

look at Walter Scott's delineation in *Ivanhoe* of Gurth the swine-herd, dressed in skins, the brass collar soldered about his neck like the collar of a dog, and upon it the inscription, "Gurth the born thrall of Cedric."

Do you boast French ancestry?—look into Orderic Vital, or Froissart, or De Comines, and see what manner of man was your ancestor, "*Jacques Bonhomme*"—kicked, cuffed, plundered, murdered, robbed of the honor of his wife and the custody of his children, not allowed to wear good clothing,* not recognized as a man and a brother,† not indeed in early times recognized as a man at all.‡

Do you boast German ancestry?—look at Luther's letters and see how the unutterable stupidity of your ancestors vexed him.

Yet from these progenitors of yours, kept besotted and degraded through centuries by oppression, have, by comparatively few years of freedom, been developed the barriers which have saved modern states.

Is it said that this bestowal of rights on the oppressed is dangerous? History is full of proofs that the faith in Heaven's justice which has led statesmen to solve great difficulties by *bestowing* rights has proved far more safe than the attempt to evade great difficulties by *withholding* rights.§

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGICAL AND RELIGIOUS.

Life and Death Eternal: a Refutation of the Theory of Annihilation. By Samuel C. Bartlett, D. D. 12mo. pp. 390. 1866. Boston: American Tract Society. New Haven: F. T. Jarman.

Royal Truths. By Henry Ward Beecher. 1866. 12mo. pp. 324. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Our Eternal Homes. By a Bible Student. Boston: Nichols & Noyes. 12mo. pp. 186.

The Home Life: in the Light of its Divine Idea. By James Baldwin Brown, B. A. New York: Appleton & Co. 16mo. pp. 327. New Haven: Judd & White.

Heaven Opened. A Selection from the Correspondence of Mrs. Mary Winslow. Edited by her son, Octavius Winslow, D. D. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 344.

Religion and Amusement: an Essay delivered at the International Convention of the Young Men's Christian Associations, held in Albany, N. Y., June 1, 1866. By Rev. Marvin R. Vincent, Pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Troy, N. Y. 1866. 8vo. pp. 28.

* † Among the grievances put forth by the nobles at the *States General* of 1614, one was that the wives of the common people wore too good clothing; another was that an orator of the third estate had dared call the nobles their brothers. Sir James Stephens's *Lectures*.

‡ For a very striking summary of this see Henri Martin's *Hist. de France*, vol. v., p. 193.

§ I know of but one plausible exception to this rule—that of the failure of Joseph II. in his dealings with the Rhine provinces. The case of Louis XVI. is no exception, for he was always taking back secretly what he had given openly.

Christian Amusements. A Discourse delivered Feb. 11, 1866, at the Annual Meeting of the Young Men's Christian Association of Saint Paul. By Rev. Edwin Sydney Williams, Pastor of the Congregational Church at Northfield, Minnesota. 1866. 8vo. pp. 31.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

Recent British Philosophy: a Review, with criticisms; including some comments on Mr. Mill's answer to Sir William Hamilton. By David Masson. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 335. New Haven: H. C. Peck.

HISTORICAL.

The American Conflict: A History of the Great Rebellion in the United States of America, 1860-1865. Its causes, incidents, and results; intended to exhibit especially its moral and political plans, with the drift and progress of American opinion respecting Human Slavery from 1776 to the close of the war for the Union. By Horace Greeley. Illustrated by portraits on steel of Generals, Statesmen, and other eminent men; views of places of historic interest; maps, diagrams of battle-fields, naval actions, etc., from official sources. Vol. II. Hartford: O. D. Case & Co. 1866. Royal 8vo. pp. 782.

Spanish Papers, and other Miscellanies, hitherto unpublished or uncollected. By Washington Irving. Arranged and edited by Pierre M. Irving. Two volumes. 12mo. pp. xv. 466, 487. New York: Hurd & Houghton.

The History of the Atlantic Telegraph from the beginning, 1854, to the completion, Aug. 1866. By Henry M. Field. With illustrations. 12mo. pp. 367. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

BIOGRAPHICAL.

Life and Letters of James Gates Percival. By Julius H. Ward. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 12mo. pp. 600. New Haven: T. H. Pease. See Advertisement, page 1 of *New Englander*. [A Review may be expected in the next number.]

Recollections of Mary Lyon, with Selections from her instructions to the pupils in Mount Holyoke Female Seminary. By Fidelia Fisk. Boston: American Tract Society, 28 Cornhill. 1866. 12mo. pp. 338.

A Memorial of Giles F. Ward, Jr., late First Lieutenant 12th New York Cavalry. By William Ives Budington, D. D. 16mo. pp. 99. New York: A. D. F. Randolph.

BELLES LETTRES.

Poems. By Christina G. Rossetti. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 256.

The Poems of Thomas Kibble Hervey. Edited by Mrs. T. K. Hervey. With a memoir. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. Blue and Gold edition. 24mo. pp. 437. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Poems. By Elizabeth Akers (Florence Percy). Boston: Ticknor & Fields. Blue and Gold edition. 24mo. pp. 251. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

A Yankee in Canada, with Anti-Slavery and Reform Papers. By Henry D. Thoreau. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 236. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

The Picture of St. John. By Bayard Taylor. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 220. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Spare Hours. By John Brown, M. D. Second Series. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 426. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Character and Characteristic Men. By Edwin P. Whipple. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 324. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

How I Managed my House on £200 (one thousand dollars) a year. By Mrs. Warren. 8vo. pp. 95. Boston: A. K. Loring.

Griffith Gaunt; or, Jealousy. By Charles Reade. With illustrations. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 8vo. pp. 214. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Frederick the Great and his Court. An Historical Romance. By L. Mühlbach; author of *Joseph II. and his Court*. Translated from the German by Mrs. Chapman Coleman and her Daughters. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 12mo. pp. 484. New Haven: H. C. Peck.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Six Months at the White House with Abraham Lincoln; the Story of a Picture. By F. B. Carpenter. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1866. 12mo. pp. 359. New Haven: Judd & White.

The Awakening of Italy, and the Crisis of Rome. By the Rev. J. A. Wylie, LL. D. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. 1866. 12mo. pp. 364.

The Omnipotence of Loving Kindness; being a Narrative of the results of a Lady's Seven Months' Work among the Fallen in Glasgow. New York: R. Carter & Brothers. 1866. 12mo. pp. 340.

Pastoral Reminiscences. By the late Rev. Martin Moore of Boston, Mass. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. 24mo. pp. 84.

Twenty Years Among the Colporteurs. By Rev. Charles Peabody, St. Louis, Missouri. American Tract Society, 150 Nassau street, New York. 24mo. pp. 91.

Treasures from the Prose Writings of John Milton. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1866. 12mo. pp. 486. New Haven: T. H. Pease.

Frank's Search for Sea-Shell. By H. F. P., author of "*Rambles after Land-Shell.*" Boston: American Tract Society, 28 Cornhill. 16mo. pp. 352.

Peat, and its Uses, as Fertilizer and Fuel. By Samuel W. Johnson, A. M. Fully illustrated. 12mo. pp. 168. New York: O. Judd & Co.

Medical Diagnosis, with Special Reference to Practical Medicine. A guide to the knowledge and discrimination of diseases. By J. M. Da Costa, M. D. Second edition revised. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 1866. pp. 784.

The Internal Revenue Laws. Act approved June 30, 1864, as amended by acts of March 3, 1865, and July 13, 1866; together with the acts amendatory: with copious marginal references; a complete analytical index, and tables of taxation and exemption. Compiled by Horace Dresser. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1866. 8vo. pp. 228.

Publications of the American Tract Society, Boston.—*Grace's Visit.* A Tale for the Young. 24mo. pp. 247.—*The Story of Zadoc Hull.* 24mo. pp. 187.—*Our Charlie; or the Little Teacher.* 24mo. pp. 125.

Publications of the American Tract Society, New York.—*Life and Times of John Milton.* By W. Carlos Martyn, Esq. 1866. 12mo. pp. 307.—*Hours with Mamma.* By Mrs. S. E. Dawes. 12mo. pp. 306.—*Among the Willows; or How to do Good.* By J. H. Langille. 1866. 12mo. pp. 128.—*Sisters, and No Sisters.* By Mrs. M. E. Berry. 12mo. pp. 246.

